DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 188 UD 033 817

AUTHOR	Singh, S. P.
TITLE	Dynamics of Deprivation and Educational Implications: Some Hypotheses and Impressions. An Interdisciplinary Sensorium Report. Revised.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	67p.; For the original report, see ED 117 255.
CONTRACT	OEG-0-70-1816 (7251)
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Child Development; Conference Proceedings; *Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Secondary Education; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Labeling (of Persons); *Learning; Linguistics; *School Role

ABSTRACT

This document is a revised report on a "sensorium" organized in 1974 to encourage participants to sense and feel the effects of deprivation on disadvantaged people, with a focus on students in elementary and secondary schools and on educators involved in educational reform efforts. The interdisciplinary gathering gave professionals a chance to sense, as well as discuss, issues of deprivation among students. Conference participants representing various disciplines explored how they defined and assessed problems of deprivation and disadvantage. It was hypothesized that the syndrome of deprivation and disadvantage is universal, with stylistic features that deprived people display universally. Among the topics discussed in the wide ranging sessions were questions of creativity, culture, communication, what it means to be disadvantaged, theories of learning, and issues related to educational equity. (Contains 54 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

UD

ED 446 188

Dynamics of Deprivation and Educational Implications

Some Hypotheses and Impressions

An Interdisciplinary Sensorium Report

Contract No. OEG 0-70-1816 (7251)

S.P.Singh, Ed.D., FPPR

The study reported herein was conducted pursuant to a training contract with BEPD, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under the Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgments in the conduct of the project. Point of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy

College of Education

University of South Florida

Tampa, Fl.

Revised

1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

U033817

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An Interdisciplinary Multiphasic, Multidimensional, Multidirectional Sensorium

Dynamics of Deprivation and Disadvantagment

Content

	Page
1. The Preface and Introductory Remarks	5
2. Contributors	10
3. Issues Discussed	12
4. General Format	13
5. General Recommendations	14
6. Some Unanswered Questions	16
7. Hypotheses	17
8. General Procedures	18
9. Operational Definitions	19
10. Sensorium Day One	20
11. Sensorium Day Two	25
Morning Session # 1	25
Morning Session # 2	27
Morning Session # 3	28
Afternoon Session # 1	29
Afternoon Session # 2	31
Afternoon Session # 3	33
Afternoon Session # 4	34
Evening Session	35
12. Sensorium Day Three Concluding Impressions	
Dr. Harry Passow	37
Mr. Erskin Caldwell	40
Dr. Herbert Aurback	42
Dr. Charles Keith	45
Dr. Raymond Patouillet	47
Dr. Fred Gearing	49
Dr. Edward Fagan	53

		Page
13.	Selected Points of Views	56
	Child in the School	56
	Classroom Behavioral Expectations	56
	Creativity	56
	Culture	56
	Community Control	57
	Communication	57
	Disadvataged	57
	Acceptance	59
	Equality and Opportunity	59
	Grading	59
	Environment and Learning	59
	Guidance	59
	Learning	60
	Linguistics	60
	Parent Teacher Relationships	61
	Power	61
	School as a Community Agency	61
	Teacher Self-Training	61
	Relationship of Teacher, Child, and Social Groups are Interdependent	62
	Teaching Styles	62
	GRE	62
14.	Refrences	

The Preface and Introductory Remarks

The study of deprivation has been limited to laboratories or specialized context such as the orphanages, drought or famine stricken areas. The study of deprivation to study our own self, our own fields of inquiries, and the institutional deprivation permeating in all spheres of our lives was the purpose of the mutiphasic, multidimensional, multidirectional sensorium. A change of venue was proposed from the study of a group or a condition occurring in a specialized context to study the deprivation as a condition affecting everyone no matter what status, wealth, knowledge, a person has. The deprivation is a condition permeating the humanity itself. A disease of a worse kind with effect to diminish the humanity or even engulf its existence. Therefore, a sensorium was organized to sense, feel and interact to understand the nature and the depth of deprivation and its effect. The effects of deprivation manifest in various forms including symptoms and behaviors such as ethnocentricity, egocentricity, controlling, subjugating behaviors, to lack of fulfillment for each and every member of the human race on the planet earth. Deprivation is not a problem of a few it is a problem of all. A condition that has manifested with its devastating effects and continues to manifest its affects all around us. Some effected by deprivation live in denial and compensate the deprivation with jewels and power, some create institutions to find the meaning and solace, some build institutions to control and in it try to find solace, some become philosophers and dig deep, some become philosophers and built theories, and construct cognitive maps of living maze, some just suffer the devastation of deprivation with no help in sight. The sensorium was to feel and study our own reality a byproduct of deprivation, evolve the beginning of the concentric circle of freedom from deprivation from one to all and from all to each and every one. The goals of sensorium were partially fulfilled. The participants were taken over by the immediacy of the problem and the devastation of deprivation affecting a group of children in schools. Participants devoted a great deal of time to seek solution for some possible methods to provide immediate relief. They were successful in making recommendations and with recommendations the first phase of the multiphasic, multidimensional, mutidirectional, sensorium came to an end. The participants went to their respective fields and perhaps were taken over by their every day demands of existence and living as the second phase of the sensorium has not yet been materialized.

The revision of the first phase was under taken to revise and seek funding to convene the second phase of the sensorium. The revision includes the summary of goals, participants' major recommendations, and author's impressionistic mumbled imprints. The revision gave the author another

opportunity to experience the reality that how easy it is to get side tracked with the day to day demands of things which could wait from the things need not wait. A condition that has become a reality and has life of its own so devouring and self consuming- a perennial form of deprivation. A challenge to balance the demands of existence to the more substantive purpose of living has never been an easy one.

As I began to revise and reflect on the original sensorium report (1974) and the task of conducting a sensorium that was undertaken at that time, I found the original report and the task just as relevant, meaningful, and challenging today as they were at the time of their inception. The sensorium task was carried out at a time when a nation was in need of educational reform: A reform to correct educational inequities for disadvantaged and disabled. During the phase of revision I was taken over by another educational reform movement. The purpose of this review was not to compare the current reform movement with the reform movement of the 60's and 70's. However, since both movements called themselves as reform movements and set out with goals to reform the educational establishment of one kind or the other, I decided to insert few words of my own impressions. The task at hand at the previous reform was to reach out and touch the core of human feelings affected by the inequities and the deprivation- an affective approach. The task of the current reform movement seems to be more cognitive constructivist and deconstructivist in nature. The leaders are joking around for the power and control in the name of ideals what ever they may be. Of course, reform movements are always affected by their respective political and economic realities and leaders though good intentioned get caught up with the prevailing reality. The challenge during the previous reform movement, as conceived by the author of this report, was to make attempts to transcend the behaviorism and the use of cognitive constructivist justifications and rationalizations. Both the behaviorism and cognitive constructivists approaches were perceived to ease the suffering at best and at worse such treatments can cause psychological and social constrain leading to conditions such as repression for survival to emerge at a later time with severe and debilitating affects. In other words the treatments in themselves might be a cause if not the cause in inflicting deprivation. Therefore, a sensorium was organized to *sense* and feel the possible self inflicted deprivation acts of humanity on itself, and to reflect on what the role of education has been in creating, and in alleviating the deprivation. A daunting yet challenging non quantifiable task of sensing the deprivation phenomenon was undertaken.

The task was not to study the deprivation, as stated above, in a laboratory or in some specialized context such as in orphanage. The task to

study the effects of deprivation in a laboratory or in orphanage is important and I had cited in previous report such research efforts to establish the need to study deprivation. However, the format for the sensorium was proposed to sense, feel, and be in a mainstream context as we attempt to understand the effects of deprivation. The task undertaken was to sense, to feel the deprivation phenomena as it affects professionals taking the role of the education reform to alleviate the debilitating and disabling effects of deprivation.

A bird's eye view of the nature of deprivation:

The psychosocial, economical, and educational deprivation, created by humanity, negatively affects its existence and compromise its living. There is no profoundness in the foregoing statement. I have simply taken the liberty to state and reaffirm a truism in simple terms. Human beings, individually and collectively, have encountered and suffered deprivation, and for centuries have caused and inflicted/enacted deprivation on each other. In so doing, either they were as a group or as an individual led to believe or had believed otherwise, that is in their acts of causing deprivation on others they were doing the "right thing" in the name of such ideals as patriotism, religion, nationalism, ethnic superiority, technocracy, aristocracy, and recent fervor of meritocracy, just to name a few. It is easy to be taken over by the so called *Mayas'* of enticing "ideals". There are numbers of philosophies of the art and the science created under the glory of "goodness" and "ideals" to inflict and justify the acts of deprivation. Many historical events provide testimonial evidence that social, economical, educational, and psychological deprivations have indeed been intentionally inflicted on humanity and the weak and disabled were first to go. Of course, that was O.K., and meant to be so professed the survival of the fittest doctrine. Such historical events (need no citations as they are numerous and well recorded in history and in many human memories) have, unfortunately, provided the bases, and worse continue, to provide bases for a perpetual cycle of deprivation and counter deprivation. Thus, making humanity's self inflicted deprivation a pervasive and perpetual phenomenon.

The dynamic of deprivation causes a unitary phenomenon -- a phenomenon of loss, bad object, and pain. Sometimes deprivation is caused by a group or groups in control of power to subjugate and deprive others to satisfy various sociopolitical economic (pathological) needs. The groups in control of power, the so called "non-deprived", benefit over the deprived by inflicting deprivation by subjugation and ceasing power. The irony is that those who subjugate and deprive others, deprive themselves of human empathy- the humanity. Some acts of deprivation are raw and crude and some come disguised by positive verbiage including the concepts of so-called "love", "good intention", "ethics", and "morality". Human love, good intentions, ethical, morals are not

immune to the act of causing deprivation. Many claimants of good intention, love, ethical, and moral proponents have caused deprivation with similar effects of loss in the same manner as those who do not declare the motives of good intention, love, ethical, and moral "dictum" and inflict deprivation. The condition of deprivation has become the truism of our existence. Deprivation is experienced and inflicted upon everyone who exists or who has existed on planet earth.

The term deprivation encompasses a complex psychosocial and biological evolutionary history characterized by our search for answers to questions about who we are. What becomes of us during a life's journey? What is the extent to which the human journey is facilitated, controlled, or deprived by design? The answer depends on our presumptions, and understandings of who We are, and what defines life. Of most importance, of course, are those presumptions and understandings of what life is without deprivation.

What we know about ourselves is learned to a great extent through our civilization, culture, education, schooling, and science. We, human beings, have created institutions committed to acculturate in the "goodness" and "ideals" of civilizations, cultures, education, schooling, and science. We know far less about how deprivation is *caused* by civilization, culture, education, schooling, and science. In comparison to the commitment for acculturation in the so called "the goodness" and "the ideals", there is a disproportionate lack of commitment to study, how societal impingements, rejections, and deprivations of human needs have been constructed, reconstructed, rationalized, and justified, by civilization, culture, education, schooling, and scientific milieu affecting human behaviors. A form of denial phenomenon augmented by ceremonial acts to camouflage the disproportionate lack of commitment to study its own self inflicted deprivation and pain. Understandable so: However, any Society with its sanctimonious ceremonies can not absolve itself of its bad object characteristics causing and perpetuating deprivation.

One effect of deprivation involves underdeveloped potential in human growth and development. Deprivation retards and steals the experiences to be experienced. A cycle of deprivation takes its root by breeding insecurity, immaturity, psychological, social, and economical compromises and adversely affecting cognitive and affective living. The state of being becomes incomplete and potential for being and doing are compromised. Deprivation undermines and diminishes the time available for personal growth. In effect, deprivation creates the unhealthy being. Deprivation has a negative impact on feeling, thinking, knowing and relating that results in impoverished feeling, thinking, knowing, and relating-creating disconnect, leaving a person

psychologically incomplete and unfulfilled. In this manner, deprivation implies a break in life's continuity.

A sensorium was organized to explore the knowledge, the knower, and the known; to sense things around which makes us less than what we are and less than what we could be and far less than a being. In all of this, what is the role of education.

The primary goal of sensorium was not the theory building, or to engage in formal ontological, epistemological dialogue, or to make efforts to develop positive logistics, or theoretical axiological parameters to perceive the affects of deprivation. The sensorium, *at its first phase*, was organized to sense the dynamics of deprivation and disadvantagment. The following pages reflect the concerned sense and recommendations of a dedicated group of professionals at a troubling and critical cross road in the history of the United States.

The sensoruium provided the high privileged milieu to sense how professionals representing various disciplines interact, define, describe and assess the problem of deprivation and disadvantagment. The interaction among participants was active and engaging, the descriptions presented were logical as well as impressionistic, and their assessment and the recommendations of the problem facing the nation were insightful. Participants were thoughtful and troubled by human plight. Their thoughts ranged from highly differentiated to amorphous and fluid. In retrospect, a conclusion can be drawn that the sesorium not only provided the opportunity for professionals to sense but also provided information for future theory building and engaging in ontological and epistemological dialogue among the concerned professionals. Participants thoughts, feelings, self representation (subjective experience), reflections of their dilemmas as observed and noted during the sensorium are presented in this report.

Surendra P. Singh, Ed.D., FPPR

Contributors*

Dr. Herbert Aurbach, Professor, Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, 220 Rackley Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Mr. Erskine Caldwell, Author, Novelist, P.O. Box 820, Dunedin, Fl. 33528.

Dr. Joan Duval, Chief, Early Childhood, Division, BEPD, United States Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert Dwyer, Associate Professor, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Edward Fagan, Professor of English Education, College of Education, Pennsylvania State University, 163 Chambers Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Dr. Marguerite Follett, Early Childhood Branch, BEPD, United States Office Education, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Fred Gearing, Professor, Department of Anthropology, State University of New York at Buffalo, New York 14226.

Dr. Charles Keith, Child Psychologist, Durham, North Carolina.

Mr. Edward Moore, Special Education/Early Childhood, BEPD, Office of Education, U.S.O.E., Washington, D.C.

Ms. Sheila MacCambridge, Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Harry Passow, Professor of Education and Department Chairman, Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York City, New York 10027.

Dr. Raymond Patouillet, Professor of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Surendra P. Singh, Associate Professor, Department of Special Education, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Ms. Jean Stovall, Instructor, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Lestor Tuttle, Professor of Education, St. Petersburg Campus, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Richard Waterman, Profesor, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Robert Weatherford, Associate Professor, Coordinator for Potential Handicapped Program, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, 33620.

*Addresses as of June 10,1970.

ISSUES DISCUSSED

1.0 LABELING

2.0 TYPES OF LEARNING

3.0 DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

4.0 TEACHING STYLES AND METHODOLOGIES

5.0 EFFECT OF THE SCHOOLS ON CHILDREN

6.0 LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS

7.0 COMMUNITY

8.0 SCHOOL RELEVANCY

9.0 SEGREGATION/INTEGRATION

10.0 CHILDREN'S GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

11.0 DOMINANCE THEORY IN SOCIOLOGY

12.0 CHANGE WITHIN THE SCHOOLS

13.0 THE IDEAL SCHOOL

14.0 HOMOGENEOUS/HETEROGENEOUS SCHOOL GROUPINGS

15.0 OBSERVATION OF THE CHILD

16.0 EVALUATION OF THE CHILD

17.0 EVALUATION OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS

18.0 TEACHER PREPARATION AND BEHAVIOR

19.0 SURVIVAL AND INSTITUTION

General Format

First Session	1. Ground rules for the following sessions 2. Each participants suggested the content for discussion and its disciplines' stand in regard to the problems under discussion (deprivation and disadvatagedment)
Second Session	The second session was devoted to spontaneous discussion by total group on the presuppositions and ground rules established during the first session.
Third Session	The third session was devoted to dialogue to formulate hypotheses and ideas for alleviation of the problems.
Fourth Session	The fourth session was devoted to the synthesis of interchange and dialogue of the first three sessions to be reported in the fifth open session.
Fifth Session	The participants appeared before the students and faculty members and reported their points of view.

General Recommendations

1. Labels needs to be put into right perspective, utilized only as an administrative construct and considered as means rather than ends in themselves.

2. Alternative plans ought to be available for the acquisition of learning.

3. Myths of homogeneity needs to be realized and heterogeneity respected.

4. Development of cohesive and empathetic classroom atmosphere should be a focal point.

5. Attempt must be made to break the cycle of psycho-social isolation among education personnel in general and children in particular.

6. Building of self confidence among all (teachers, parents, children, teacher educators, etc.) Must be stressed.

7. Develop survival skills among children.

8. Concept of pluralism needs to be internalized.

9. Learning must be fostered in a natural way.

10. Psycho-social condition creating disadvantagement needs to be studied and ameliorated.

11. Schools must become personalized rather than depersonalized bureaucratic structure.

12. Educational components needs to be aligned with the human growth and development.

13. Educational personnel must become sensitized with plurality and self

accepting attitudes and become aware of real problems rather than dwelling Into the projections and displacements.

14. Team teaching should become a process of utilization of resources for the betterment of education rather than turn taking mechanism.

15. Teachers to be recognized as professionals must accept the responsibilities there to and need not be supervised.

16. Individuals in the field of education must study their personal biases and prejudices as these operate in an instructional situation.

17. Teachers need to become aware of procedures related to assessment and individual instruction.

18. Language to be considered as a mean for the purpose of communication and be modified accordingly.

19. Re-assess the existing educational assumptions according to the current context.

Some Unanswered Questions

1. The question of how psychological conflicts or intellectual handicapping conditions play a significant role in making learning a painful experience was not addressed. These omissions demonstrate that participants were seeking some "intellectual coping" paradigm (P.8). Some consensus was achieved, however, when participants readily agreed the optimum condition for learning is to be found within close student/subject matter match. Participants appeared to have used their pragmatic talent to seek some immediate relief.

2. Questions of interface and inter-dynamics of context, goals and players (student, teachers, and content) were not addressed. Further, psychological factors such as resistance, defense mechanisms, compromise formations that may also play significant roles were not discussed. The conceptual and perceptual factors affecting the receptivity for change were not delineated.

Hypotheses

A 72 -hour interdisciplinary sensorium was conducted to study how professionals representing various disciplines interact, define, describe and assess the problem of deprivation and disadvantagment. Prior to the beginning of the sensorium the following hypotheses were developed that the analysis of participants interaction, views, and comments would reflect that:

1. The Syndrome of deprivation is a unitary phenomenon.

2. Some have experienced deprivation disproportionately at a given time and place.

3. Stylistic features displayed by individuals under deprived conditions are Universal.

4. Ecology of educational approaches (personnel, teaching techniques, materials and physical conditions) in schools are incongruent to human growth and development

5. Ethnocentric and egocentric behaviors and the institutions fostering such phenomenon enhance negative projections, displacement and rationalization, thus creating conditions for deprivation.

6. Institutional dynamics (including reward and punishment systems) and structure of polarity and dichotomy that separates thinkers creates conditions to foster deprivation.

7. Reality and the nature of isolation among various disciplines, and existence of superfluous administrative structures to separate disciplines may be one of the significant variables fostering institutional deprivations.

8. Universals of human feelings and thinking can be studied in a sensorium format- by analyzing the key words, the statements, and the context promulgating the use of word(s) and statements.

The above hypotheses were qualitatively substantiated.

General Procedures

Professionals from academia and government agencies representing different disciplines such as psychology, sociology, anthropology and education were contacted at various universities in the United States by mail (see the Appendix A). Following the response to the first letter, a second letter (see the Appendix B) was sent to individuals who agreed to participate, informing them the general intent and the format of the sensorium.

During the sensorium some planned key words (inner and external object related) were introduced such as sensitivity, self, whole, etc.

The sensorium was conducted for three days. Participants were encouraged to focus on the issues of education for the disadvantaged and to identify the conditions generating deprivation.

The first two days were devoted for general discussion in which participants identified and discussed various issues (see list of issues on page---). On the final day, participants made recommendations and concluding remarks.

At the end of the sensorium the key words and the statements made by the participants along with participants concluding remarks were published.

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of the sensorium, the following operational definitions were proposed:

Deprivation: A psychosocial, biological, and educational condition creating a sense of loss or a sense of being deprived.

Disadvantaged: Individuals and groups affected by negative psychosocialeconomic and educational construct.

Education: The acquisition and creation of knowledge to dream, imagine, create, and feel; to become and be.

Learning: A process of learning (some explanation of three R's) (3 R's) and survival skills.

Learning Disability: 1) consequence of inadequate and incongruent learning conditions; 2) functional discrepant outcome of incongruent concept formation. . The learning disability originates in 1) the lack of understanding of developmental concept formation among teachers, parents, and related societal performance expectations, and 2) educational tasks incongruent to the child's developmental psychosocial and biological capacity.

Sensorium: 1) A group discussion, free exchange of ideas, and feelings; 2) Process of destifling sensory modalities in the search for answers to questions; 3) Process to analyze the attributes and multiplicity of meanings inherent in frequently used words; 4) an ecological and relativistic environment in which the human senses of feeling and thinking are valued, and assumptions generating and fostering the disruptions of human ecology can be discussed.

Sensorium Day One

At the outset, the participants discussed the effects of curriculum on the disadvantaged, the effects of labeling on the child, educational strategies, Head Start, heterogeneous vs. homogeneous student groupings, classroom atmosphere, communication, and the value system. From the beginning the participants began to explore the modes of communication and opportunities for new perceptions. The key words such as labeling, educational strategies, Head Start, heterogeneous vs. homogeneous, classroom atmosphere, communication, and the value systems, reflect timely educational concerns. Participants discussed learning as a "painful" experience, how to make learning more meaningful, and how to integrate it into a child's life. Participants conceived learning as a means of expression and education as a "{movement} of ideas into different planes of perception" (Patouillet, 5). Learning is "painful at precisely the point where you need a new parody to assimilate that which is coming in (Aurbach, 8)". The question, of whether all new parody is painful was not addressed.

The discussion then changed focus to a study of "advantaged" and "disadvantaged" children and teachers/teaching. The group stressed that schools 'assault' student identity on the basis of their race and socioeconomic status. It was stated that the schools "assault" the identity of the child and force him into a stylistically hostile system of interpersonal relations. One participant cited the Coleman report to support the contention that self-identity is the most important variable in terms of school achievement.

Teaching was described as an "attempt to develop social integration and survival behaviors in students." At this point, Singh & Aurbach suggested the question of dependency and independency. Singh and Aurback suggested that perhaps it is about time to first address certain questions regarding to our own (Sensorium participants) self, especially if we assumed that clarifications and understandings of "self" generates independence. The process of understanding "self", it was suggested, might help in clarifying the muddled projection and displacement, which may affect the behavior of teachers and teacher educators. Aurbach stated that 'if I'm not able to reach that child, then the most ... I don't understand *[is]* myself. He stressed the fact that there is some sort of identity with the self among all of us. Such insightful incision is what we lack.

Participants also discussed the importance of environmental factors and the common recommendations for reinvestigation of those environmental factors. When discussing

these factors, group members stressed that generalizations about any social group of children can not be made, nevertheless children are "pigeon holed" by social class in unrealistic categories.

The question of social investigation procedures in education was addressed. Data derived is circumspect as "one stylistic system transposed into another stylistic system".

On the question of Segregation/Integration the group unanimously agreed that education must teach children to "work in the context of integration".

Dr.Fagan initiated discussion of the term 'disadvantaged,' by positing that the term is indeed relative, in the sense that it is amenable to a great latitude of personal interpretation. He further noted that "disadvantagement" may be construed as a self-fulfilling prophecy because: "... the classification itself, as several of you know, has caused some problems in that it gets teachers to treat kids as though they were Disadvantaged". Dr. Fagan continued, stating the 'term is indeed inappropriate, and that /he/ personally, would prefer the term 'disaffected,' as the term may be applied to all kids.'_

The conversation then focused on Dr. Aurbach. Agreeing with the rest of the panel, he posited that "disadvantagement" and "cultural deprivation" were both "unfortunate" terms. Adding to the "relativistic" dimension manifested in his previous statements, Dr. Aurbach then posited that disadvantagement, by definition, presupposes a superiority/inferiority dichotomy when employed in cultural comparisons. He stated that "differences" seen among cultures were not necessarily "disadvantaged" and those, in education, " focus on differences". In the use of adaptive behaviors of ghetto children, these differences may be quite "adaptive" in nature. In response, Aurbach added that education must build student "strengths, not weaknesses" - the latter of which he feels education has unduly emphasized. Another panel member who posited that "the IQ tests do not measure intelligence," stated that "IQ is to be seen as a cultural artifact." The discussion continued as Dr. Singh related an anecdote of personal experience with the GRE examination, and his feeling that the test did not measure "personal self" or "imagination or what an individual might have to offer qualitatively". He (Dr. Singh) stated that based on the quantitative inference alone predictions regarding human behaviors are limited.

The panel then changed focus to the discussion of "language and the disadvantaged child." Dr. Aurbach initiated the discussion stating that "such students (disadvantaged) must learn Standard English." Dr. Patouillet, in turn responded with the analogy that a disadvantaged child learning English is the same as a middle class child learning French. The panel also addressed the implications of allowing students to develop their own language structure, and the question of "non-verbalness" of disadvantaged children. A panel member expressed the opinion that these students were indeed verbal, albeit their communication was "different" and that they are only "non-verbal in the language we (the schools) impose on them."

Following the question of language, the panel returned to the question of disadvantagement and the schools. This area was reopened by Dr. Fagan who related that he believed schools should allow students to "do their own thing," yet it should be within the genre of a "means to an end." Although unstated, it can be inferred that this "end" is to be understood as learning as in the "3 R's." Responding to the question of the schools, Dr. Fagan then related that "school systems that do not accept children of differing cultures tend to turn them (kids) off." Continuing his line of thought Dr. Fagan expressed the opinion that schools, as acculturation agents, cannot "communicate with these students if we tell them everything they have learned in the past is wrong ".

The panel continued in its analysis of "disadvantagement." Throughout this discussion the panel made many interesting and mordant points. As debate continued, participants increasingly emphasized questions of current challenges in the school system. The group focused on the disadvantaged child, and the "myths" of disadvantagement. Included among these issues were the IQ question, the "non-verbalness" of disadvantaged children and the apotheosizing of "Standard English" within the public schools.

Mr. Caldwell, the novelist, joined the discussion offering some personal anecdotes from his educational experiences in rural Georgia. In recounting his past Mr. Caldwell emphasized his perceptions that there was a certain lack of "relevancy" in schooling This lack, he claimed, may have caused one of his friends to drop out. According to Mr. Caldwell, his friend told him "I want to learn agricultural sciences; and here I am told to read Latin and told to do arithmetic and told to study English etc,. I don't mind doing that, but I'm going to be a farmer. I might want to be a dairy farmer in particular." Mr. Caldwell claimed his friend thought education was impractical and meaningless. On the question of disadvantaged children, Mr. Caldwell reemphasized these perceptions when he stated the educational process might create disadvantagement by its "great emphasis on the liberal arts side of it...rather than on the practical workshop-type of knowledge."

The conversation then turned to Dr. Dwyer, who introduced his interest in "education of the young child,". After recounting the contemporary issues within his field, Dr. Dwyer focused on his perception that "for the first time, American educators are teaching children skills previously taught by their parents." Continuing, he related that disadvantaged children, unlike middle class children, were not inculcated academic achievement (unspecified) values by their parents. Therefore, he stated "lower class children are less ready to be coerced" within school environment. (Dr. Dwyer defined "coercion," , as that activity whereby a dominant group attempts to inculcate its values on another group). Stating that the disadvantaged child is less amenable to such coercion, he posited that this child "resists irrelevant learning.". He further stated that the school must achieve some degree of interface with these children's home lives if learning is to be facilitated. Recounting the view that current teaching methodologies are delimiting with respect to "learning choice," he called for the investigation of various teaching styles designed to make subjects such as reading and mathematics "more meaningful."

The panel then focused on Dr. Patouillet, who posed three additional questions on the subject of disadvantagement. These questions were: 1) could a term be found to adequately describe what the panel had been calling "disadvantaged"?, 2) could a pluralistic society in which the advantaged/disadvantaged schism has been created succeed?, and 3) what is the position of "individuality in a pluralistic society"?

Dr. Fagan, following this thread of "individuality and disadvantagement,", cited the Squire and Appleby studies in England. He stated that in these studies, the strategy for "approaching teaching was non-formal, with options left open to the student." Dr. Fagan then related an additional perception: that, to do an adequate job in the question of disadvantagement, the panel must function within a delimited scope -: namely "the child within the school." He related "it seems to me that we are interested in what happens in the school,.... and what happens to make the child disadvantaged."

Following Dr. Fagan's lead, the panel then, began an investigation into the position of the disadvantaged child within the school. Dr. Tutle, in addressing the question of disadvantagement, took a sociological prospective, utilizing his perception of "community" and its relation to the schools. He hinted at an underlying supposition that, within American Society, the breakdown of "community" has coerced the schools to become the socialization agent for the disadvantaged child. He described a common belief that the "function of public education is to develop common perceptions and values so that people can live together in an interdependent society". Expounding his point of view within the topic of schools and curricular organizational methodologies, he explained that such contrivances as the "tracking" method has produced de facto segregation along socioeconomic and racial lines.

Not all panel members agreed with Dr. Tutle's beliefs in the school's purpose in acculturation. Referring specifically to the business of education, another panel member questioned whether the major emphasis should be placed on academic courses when only "15% of the students go on to college". The panel member believed that this misalignment of emphasis, deprives many students, notably the disadvantaged of "adequate vocational preparation". Another panel member quickly challenged the point of vocational education by claiming "academics are not the problem, it is the manner in which we teach it". In substantiating his position, he related that teaching methodologies could be considered circumspect when they produce "70% of the students below grade norms".

The discussion then refocused on Dr. Patouillet. He again questioned the terms "disadvantaged" and "advantaged". Also, he emphasized the "plight of the black man," and claimed a need to investigate disadvantagement and its effect on educational programs. Another panel member related that within the broad heading of "disadvantagement", little distinction was to be found on racial guidelines. This member further related, that within broad areas of economic realities, the social milieu, jobs, and schools, disadvantaged groups exhibited great similarity.

At this point, the sensorium had seemingly focussed on the issue of disadvantagement, and delimited the discussion to "what" disadvantagement is and "who" it affects. Dr. Tutle related that the schools now function as a dominant acculturation agent for children who do not benefit from the academically oriented home lives experienced more often by middle class students. This was a significant contribution to the sensorium as it focussed attention on the school as both a societal simulacrum and as a puissant acculturation agent.

At the end of the first session, the key words and the conclusions drawn reflected the participants' deep concerns. These concerns included the notion that "tracking" in the schools could cause de facto socioeconomic segregation; the idea that "lower class kids are less ready to be (educationally) coerced" and the concept that "..educational process itself could cause people to become disadvantaged. In addition to these points of discussion, the group highlighted the significance of "curricular relevancy" in the schools and, the notion that children are not involved and engaged in something that is "real".

Sensorium Day Two

Morning Session # 1

The key words, statements and the concepts discussed during this session were: "dominance" theory in society, dichotomy of rich and poor lifestyles, affective domain behaviors, hypothesizing the presupposition of Head Start, the "we need to focus on the system of education and what it does to people", " there is something lousy happening in the school and it probably has to do with the affront on the identities of kids", and "insensitivity" of the teacher to the students.

Together, these topics This session centered more generally on the question raised in The previous session about the respective role of the school in society. The session began with reflections relating an additional aspect of the term disadvantaged: that "disadvantagement" may be synonymous with "successful" or "unsuccessful". It was suggested that in developing a working definition of disadvantagement, the term might be devoid of delimiting terms such as "urban" or "rural". Some participants suggested that "disadvantagement" should perhaps be studied as the general factor affecting all human beings. This was followed by another remark that in studying the disadvantaged, we find more common traits (homogeneity). Unfortunately however, there are certain aspects (such as ...) exclusive to certain races such as black and disadvantaged. Singh (p.33) suggested a point that perhaps we need to explore the conditions (specific psychosocial conditions) creating disadvantagement. Singh also observed that, regardless of racial background, certain stylistic features caused by the deprivation can be observed across nations and cultures.

The sensorium discussed the issue of segregation/integration within the schools. The initial speaker related that black segregated schools were largest numerically while American Indian schools were the most "tightly" segregated. Continuing, he then related that in studies completed, students in racially heterogeneous groupings exhibit higher productivity and achievement. However, he also stated that the teachers in these schools, if not actual members of the dominant racial group, had been inculcated into the ethos of this group. The participants further discussed that both disadvantagement and classroom atmosphere warranted any consideration in the examination of such schools. The speaker stressed that, to better serve the disadvantaged population, society must reexamine "successful" schools and students in an attempt to emulate their methods.

The next topic discussed was the Title I aspect of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The speaker believed this act did much to foster disadvantagement in the

schools through "labeling" as discussed earlier. The focus then shifted abruptly to a question of "relevancy" of educational tasks and teaching methodologies and the socioeconomic backgrounds of the disadvantaged children. The speaker stressed that, within this area, the categorizing of children by socioeconomic status and housing area and type must be minimized.

The concluding area discussed in this session was an interesting probe into whether the growth/ development of children related to differing classroom and instructional methodologies. This discussion, spurred by a group member's contribution, quickly expanded into a discussion of the impact of television on children and especially that of the program "Sesame Street". Anecdotes as to the genesis of this, then nascent program, were discussed as the panel questioned whether it could be dismissed as "brainwashing" or "sensory bombardment". However, it was the feeling of several members that the methodologies employed -such as, "building on the familiar" - may have the great impact within the classroom.

Taking a sociological perspective, Dr. Singh initiated what can be called the "dominance theory" within schools, one group "tends to exert influence over another", teachers frequently manifest such behavior in the classroom. The question are such dominance behaviors having any adverse affects need to be studied. The adverse dominance situations are treatable. Following this lead, another panel member related that, although such a situation may exist, it may be minimized through materials specifically designed for the disadvantaged student. Recounting anthropological studies the point was then made that such materials have been used successfully in ghetto schools. On the question of language, a member stated: "The language spoken by blacks is not inferior, but different" , Dr. Patouillet followed; stating that such dichotomization coupled with the predilection towards Standard English has created de facto segregation and inferior status for disadvantaged children.

The panel then turned to the question of early intervention and Head Start programs, Dr. Singh started the discussion with a comment that such programs "must focus on acceptance of children of differing socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds". "Acceptance", in this case, is to be construed as "acceptance beyond tolerance level"--- a substantive change in attitude.

During this session the major points discussed were the "dominance" theory and investigation of the Head Start programs as they were utilized in assisting the disadvantaged child. Panelists achieved consensus on both issues. Participants agreed that "dominance" is an impediment to the disadvantaged and that, as a methodology, Head Start has been ineffective.

Morning Session # 2

The key words, statements, and the concepts discussed during this session were:

Change within the schools via de jure structure, institutions/institutionalized behavior, imponderables and impermeable barriers that produce power flow without communication, performance and performance contracting, "hard core" teaching, teaching in which the child learns words within the "appropriate context", ways to create academic relevance through "functional usage of reading and math", (not teaching, but to have them pick up words in their environment that were important, meaningfulness, classroom as an "artificial environment"), the need for a more natural classroom, and optimal starting ages for young school children. The critical words used include autolectic response, functionality, relevancy, meaningfulness, typology, face validity.

The session focused on the concept of schools as a relatively monolithic institution. The panel related its view that, as large institutions, schools and school boards are not amenable either to change or communication.

In Dr. Dwyer's presentation he relayed his conception of "hard core" teaching. According to Dr. Dwyer, "hard core" teaching emphasizes not only "words" but also the social/environmental context within which they are expressed. Dr. Dwyer further explained that methodologically, such a teaching technique was essentially "trial and error". This program is "to help kids get a real running the head start at academics so that their attitude is one that perceives academics as functional." Dr. Dwyer stated that "functionality" is to be seen as essentially synonymous to "relevancy". The focus then changed to the question of the "typology" of experiences that create "relevancy" in the classroom. Following within the genre of "face validity", the point of utilization/maximization of "functional" aspects of the society within the classroom was proposed. The panel also focused on the necessity of "integrating" reading/mathematics/socialization to achieve the apotheosized "relevancy." There was no closure to the question of whether "meaningful" can be interfaced with "relevancy" in the form of a school/community interface when disparity exists between school and community resources, goals, and aspirations. The efforts were made to explore methods to reach the disadvantaged child within the classroom structure. While the panel remained divided over the issue of educational goals, the areas of "curriculum relevancy" and "language interface" predominated the discussion. At this juncture, panelists agreed school played the role of a societal acculturation agent. However, Dr. Aurbach has continued to maintain a more delimited posture in relation to the goals of education (to inculcate basic educational skills) and as such, he has remained distinctly polar, yet important.

Morning Session # 3.

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

Change, the study of research/research methodologies, parents as a community resource, non-reinforcing home environment, new teaching methods (team teaching, individualized instruction, etc.) are fallacious, readiness, style of learning, peer relationships, supposition that educators believe any change will be beneficial, supposition that educators do not understand reason for change, reasons for change (change of relationship, creation of an environment), concept of the ideal school, socialization as effecting the school environment, motivation behind structural typology, poverty/wealth in relation to the schools, school organization (homogeneous/heterogeneous etc.),

Facing the concept of "change" early in the session, the sensorium related that, as a methodology of understanding change, "parental involvement" was necessary. A panel member, then "seconded" this view, within the perspective that the disadvantaged child did not have the advantage of an "academically oriented" or "reinforcing" home life. However, Dr. Aurbach then related his feeling that the normal classroom was far too constraining an environment to facilitate any form of change. He continued, stating his view that many of the new teaching methods such as team teaching were not aiding students and that "readiness" of learners and "styles of learning" were aspects of the learning paradigm that must be considered.

Another panel member followed with a more philosophical questioning of change and structure. The panel member related his opinion, that some educators will accept any change as beneficial and that educators, in reality, do not "understand the reasons for change." This member then posited that change occurs as a "change of relationship" or as the creation of new environment.

The panel then focused on the creation of the "ideal school", with members providing personal insights as to the form this might take. Several "modern schools" were discussed: Summerhill, The Orson Bean School and Harlem Prep. Within the study of these schools, a panel member related that an area for study within these schools should be "home environment factors that determined children's ability to socialize in groups." This led to a general discussion of the school and the perceived differentiation in urban and rural schools. The panelists' major question was "how can we maximize the environmental cues that each area (rural/urban) offers." It was suggested that possibly, the most meaningful technique to employ is a reexamination of the "total school environment" or the "ecology" of the school.

The panel members then entered a "free association" discussion of what might determine an "ideal school." The panel offered many opinions: that the ideal school must "involve" students, that the school must be "goal directed" and that the school must be involved within the community. The position of such a school was then questioned as a subsystem to the larger "school system". Within this area, the school was questioned in relation to

both teacher involvement and unions. Also questioned were the "standards" that the school must adhere to. Within this discussion, group members highlighted Harlem Prep as an example of an "open" school.

At the close of the session, panelists questioned the subject of the school in relation to heterogeneity of student groupings but did not reach consensus or closure.

This session was possibly the most "interesting" session to date. One intriguing exchange centered on the question of the structure, function, and philosophical position of schools within the milieu of American society. Also discussed was the concept of the ideal school, its composition and its relationship with its environment. Major factors embodied in this school were "openness", "relevancy", and "community interface".

Before ending discussion, panelists briefly touched on several other issues including: the position of the teacher, the types and consequences of change, and the home/school dichotomy as it relates to attitudes facilitative of learning in young disadvantaged children.

Afternoon Session # 1.

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

To view an individual "in his uniqueness, you begin to imagine him as a social isolate"; "when teachers attempt to facilitate learning, they influence the student in a manner which may be "unnatural"; supposition that the teacher/student role differentiation is a hierarchical construct; variables of the classroom, classroom is an "enormously complex incomprehensible thing"; supposition that "study" information may not be of use in the classroom; supposition that the classroom teacher is the most important individual within a class; supposition that all actions/studies must be judged whether or not they "help the teacher see what's going on in the classroom"; study of the individual's behavior within the matrix of all behavior; a call for delimitation of concept of role as a "transaction" among people; supposition that the time necessary to develop a good teacher is three years; interaction communication modes: we/they, you know/they know; amalgamation of communication as "we", a call for the utilization of a "universal language"; supposition that the language program is the prime directive in classroom activity;; supposition that requirements such as English produce a high "drop-out" rate; "generation gap" as historical construct; supposition that student rebellion is caused by lack of expression; supposition that teachers in a classroom must have a "monitoring system to get feedback"; supposition that feedback "would work best in a self monitoring system".

This section of the sensorium was a particularly interesting one, focusing on the concept of student/teacher relationships and their observation within the classroom. The session began when a panel member stated that, when viewing an individual through any means,

(tapes/film/direct observation, etc.), the teacher is, in reality, perceiving this individual "in his uniqueness and [you] begin to perceive him as social isolate. The panel then focused on the question of "student and teacher choice" and the effects forced choice might have on the student. One panel member hypothesized that in influencing the student, the teacher might make a decision that could be perceived as "unnatural" for the student. This statement led to the question of teacher role which panel members agreed to be the role of "expert" and facilitator of change. The panel then focused on the issue of the "classroom" as the medium within which student/teacher interaction occurs. Although related as being an "enormously complex incomprehensible thing ", the group members did not analyze the issue further.

Dr. Fred Gearing led the discussion of a teacher's classroom role. He made several points including: 1) within the class the teacher is "most important"; 2) studies must center on the question of helping the teacher understand classroom activity; and 3) in student-teacher interaction, the concept of "role" is paramount. This questioning of the teacher was continued through an analysis of teaching methods/effectiveness in relation to "constrained" school environments. Utilizing the subject of English as a medium, a panel member related that English should be "made an elective within high schools" and that "curricular requirements have led to the high dropout rate".

The Panel then turned to Mr. Erskin Caldwell for his views on the points under discussion. Initially, a panel member questioned Mr. Caldwell as to his use of "universal language" in his writings. Mr. Caldwell, utilizing the "generation gap" as a tool, recounted the development of the school and the position of the teacher as a facilitator to assist students in "self-expression." Mr. Caldwell then addressed the issues of teacher training and preparation, making the point that, within a classroom, all teachers need a performance "monitoring system" designed to give feedback. Mr. Caldwell made the session's concluding statements by expressing his opinion that the best system would be one that was self-monitored (by individual teachers).

In this session the panel focused on the role of the classroom teacher as an originator/facilitator of "communication." The communicative emphasis focused on methods to facilitate presentation and learning of material and need for a "feedback" mechanism designed to assist the teacher in evaluation. To a limited degree, panelists also discussed the structure of circumscribed curriculum and the feeling that students "progress best with the least constraints" in the form of required curricula.

Afternoon Session # 2.

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

- Axiology
- Evaluation of success/failure in school programs and the relation of the individual child to such evaluation
- A child's relationship to peers/society/teacher,
- Supposition that "school is a system; and as such, the question arises as to the best method of manipulating it",
- Supposition that self-concept is important,
- Need for teachers to become sensitized to a child's cultural values
- Supposition that children should be involved in the "decision making process of the school",
- Supposition that "programs are developed without a 'sense of community'"
- Supposition that dichotomous views of "community" exists among educators and community members,
- Supposition that "feedback" or "monitoring" mechanism need to be both internal and external,
- Murray Wax Paper----"Local school Boards---Gophers or Gadflys?",
- School boards are "economic as opposed to educational",
- Supposition that accountability may be seen as "subverting curriculum to popular opinion",
- Educator as community/school liaison,
- "Community control",
- Failure and poverty in society and existent economy,
- Supposition that the school exists with delimited perspective,
- Supposition of the lack of consensus in "goals" of the society,
- Axiological systems can not be hierarchically perceived,
- Values are "expressed through behavior and as situations of choice",
- The role of schools in values inculcation,
- Entropy in cybernetics of information exchange from feedback to teacher to parents etc.,

The session began with a discussion of the success/failure of students in school programs. Group members emphasized the relationship of the child/school/teacher/program in an attempt to discover an underlying failure causation. Dr. Passow questioned the school as a sub-system, and, as such, the group called for the study of the school "as a system and as such the question arises as to the best method of manipulating it." He then focused on the school/student relationship and how it relates to the child's self-concept. Indeed, the group agreed Self-concept was of great import within the study of the disadvantaged child. The panel's emphasis on the "importance of the self-concept" and development of

"respect for the child" led to the conclusion that "the child must be involved in the decision-making process of the school."

The panel discussion then shifted to the aspect of "community." Mr. Moore, perceiving the school system and community as polar entities, related that "programs in the schools are developed without an understanding of community." He continued, stating that the term "community" - the crux of the discussion - has diametrically opposed connotations for the educator and the community. Mr. Moore stated "without community support, your program is doomed to failure." Utilizing this statement as an entrée, he approached the subject of "community control." Questioning the use of the school board, he related that "community control" in and of itself is a misnomer because the community rarely - if ever - achieves the type of consensus necessary to exert sufficient influence to be considered "control." However, he did call for "community involvement in educational decisions," when such involvement could be helpful, but he questioned the fact that community control may, in reality, be "subverting curriculum to popular opinion."

The panel then returned to the question of the disadvantaged child in the schools, emphasizing the issue of "poverty." The term "poverty" was discussed generically within the genre public education. The supposition was made that, within the schools, poverty may be related to paucity in societal skills, i.e. reading and writing, and that this may indeed be a more meaningful methodology to employ in the analysis of poverty within schools.

The next issue discussed was the bifurcation evident in the use of the term "education" within the sense that "education" exists within a "formal" and "normal" sense. The supposition was that within the schools, the "formal" aspect is stressed, positing a delimited perception of the term. The delimitation, it is felt by this panel member, is causal in the lack of "consensus" within the goals of the society manifested through the schools. Panel opinion was that "some consensus must be achieved." As teleology and axiology are, by definition, interrelated, the panel discussed the "values" necessary within this system. "Values" were discussed philosophically, with the orientation of the panel leading to the view that "values are relative and expressed through behaviors." The question of value inculcation was discussed. However, it was stressed that the school cannot take on the role of "choosing values for students."

At the close of the session, the panel again refocused on the issue of community control within the schools. The panel felt "control" is best operationalized via "feedback" or "monitoring" devices that operate between the school/teacher and parent, and that such "monitoring must occur on several (unspecified) levels."

Afternoon Session # 3.

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

- Feedback and invasion of teacher privacy,
- Perception that "teachers must be in personal control, and happy with what they are doing",
- Supposition that the school must be "open, flexible and competent",
- School/hospital analogy,
- Minority representation/community involvement,
- Question of power,
- Supposition that for minority groups, "the system never worked for them",
- Supposition that the schools must create more value choices,
- Educational-employment interface,
- "Creativity" in relation to circumscribed courses offered at the university level,
- Perception that students must have freedom of choice "apart from the establishment",

- Coercion of the "establishment",
- Academic freedom and elementary school,
-

This session continued the analysis of the feedback question developed at the close of the last session. In this session, group members considered "feedback as an invasion of teacher privacy." Feedback was to be understood within the parameters of "accountability." Panelists pointed out that teacher observation/feedback, as a sampling technique, "may be 'unrepresentative' of the wider actions that the teacher may manifest.

The panel then focused on the issue of the school and teaching methodologies, emphasizing the importance of the school to be an "open, flexible and competent" unit. This view led directly into an analysis of the school in relation to both minority group relations and as a community involvement agency and the supposition that "power" could be generated by "getting people involved". The panel expressed differing views regarding this question of power. However, there was a consensus that within minority groups, "the system has never worked for them."

Next, the panel returned to the question of "values". This time panelist emphasized the question of values and the school in relation to the disadvantaged child. Panelists contended that the school as an institution has become "value loaded" in relation to ethnic groups, and this orientation influences the institution to "label children." The

question of value was expounded in the domain of the racial employment/unemployment question but this question was not discussed in depth.

In addition to the question of values, the sensorium focused on creativity. Positing that creativity must be a "working component" of university programs, Mr. Caldwell called for students to develop "freedom of choice apart from the establishment" and that the student who develops in this manner, will, in reality "go further."

At this point, the discussion indicated the group was positing both circumscribed developed views on the issues of feedback and the role of the school as a community acculturation agent. Although relating that some "feedback" into the "teaching system" is necessary, the panel did not yet achieve consensus on the methodology to operationalize this theoretical construct.

Afternoon Session # 4.

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

- Supposition that the sensorium is bifurcated into social scientists and educators,
- Disadvantaged child makes "special demands" within the classroom,
- Supervisor/teacher liaison,
- Supposition that parents are not in agreement with educators or social scientists,
- Content vs. the climate in the classroom,
- Supposition that children learn best in an open climate,
- Language and dialect,
- Transformational grammar and positive effects,
- Adaptive education,
- Diagnosis to ascertain needs,

The session began with a redirection of the child within the classroom. Several panel members led initially by Dr. Keith believed the disadvantaged child makes "special demands" within the classroom. These panelist stated the teacher must act as a liaison between the school and the home. Within this view, several others related the opinion that thus far the teacher has performed inadequately. Additional panelists countered, stating that teachers "are indeed successful" by "balancing two issues---the methodological and the social system of the teacher and the pupil." Most panelists acceded the classroom climate - especially an open climate - was important.
One panel member related the existence of programs (unspecified) that utilize disadvantaged children's home dialect as a learning/facilitation tool and, after a period, gradually switch instruction to Standard English. Another panel member mentioned the Ohio State University studies of "transformational grammar", explaining these programs were similar to those previous speaker had discussed.

Moving along the panel discussed the topic of "adaptive education" utilizing the concept of learning programs that could/should involve the disadvantaged "Adaptive education" was posited as an open education model that would allow students to "proceed at their own rate" and abolish "gradedness," "time periods," and other

classroom constraints. Although stated philosophy, a panel member questioned the "delivery" of such a program as it would "produce more work, and as such, would be objected by teachers and teacher unions."

The sensorium then refocused on the "what/who" question of disadvantagement. One member stated the sensorium had "skirted the issue." This panel member called for "more accurate" and "better" diagnosis of the educational needs of disadvantaged children. Relating that education of the disadvantaged must focus on "small groups" and "develop the direction" (unspecified) this panel member declared the sensorium must "state what the educational system is/is not doing for these (disadvantaged) kids.

The main thrust of this session developed along two foci: the child in the classroom and the development of "adaptive education." In the previous sessions, the panel began to derive some consensus as to the "who" of disadvantagement but at this point, the emphasis evolved to the question of "what to do with" the disadvantagement. The underlying emphasis, however, remains on "relevancy", that attempts to maximize the social/intellectual interface" between the home, culture, and school.

An interesting development in this session was that of adaptive education, that education whose philosophical raison d'être is to maximize the propensity of such an interface. In operationalizing the concepts of "adaptive education" the epistemology embodied drew heavily on the "open education" model.

Evening Session.

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

- Hawthorne effect,
- Perception that educators "keep touching on things that are on the periphery",
- "Global" methodologies,
- Community plurality,
- Parochial emphasis of schools,
- Perception that university people cannot "answer all of the questions",
- Perception that university functions to "give you perspective in which you can look at the school in a different way than we've looked at it before",
- Perception that expected behaviors cannot be specified,
- Classroom organizational theory (methodology of age grading, curriculum, and learning styles),

The session began with a discussion of the "Hawthorne Effect" on students and teachers in educational settings. The panel member presenting this issue explained this phenomenon could best be illustrated through "the teacher, not the student." This panel member then entered into the question that educators "keep touching on things that are on the periphery" and do very little to change the total educational environment. The Panelist asserted that attempt to change a few teachers in isolated workshops would have no overall effect, the panelist argued the need to implement a wide-ranging teacher-training program.

The next issue mentioned was that "community plurality" exists as a polar construct to the "parochial emphasis of schools." This supposition was not discussed in depth.

Teacher preparation was the next issue discussed. Taking the role of the educator, a panel member related that, within the university setting, professors could not be expected to "answer all questions." The panel member did relate, however, that "the function of the university is to give perspectives in which you look at the school in differing ways than we've looked at it before." On the subject of teacher training, a panel member posited that colleges of education are attempting to develop - but have yet to expand upon - programs to address "expected teacher behaviors" in relation to intellectual and social competencies. The panel member further related that the school must be a "learning environment" and assist in children's "role development."

The panel then moved to discuss the question of "teacher/classroom/educational system and community interface." One group member analyzed the school as a social system and related that the teacher is, in reality "responsible to the community through the syllabus. This panelist asserted that a preconceived syllabus functions as a "restrictive environment with respect to innovation." Panelists also referred to questions related to classroom organizational methodologies such as "age-grading" "curriculum experiences," and "learning styles and possibilities" as strategies/structures to be employed in teaching the disadvantaged, but no details were provided.

Sensoruim Day Three

FINAL SESSION-- INDIVIDUAL REPORTS

Concluding Impressions

Dr. Harry Passow

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

Fullest potential, egalitarian model, equality, love, goodwill, "in certain sense all pupils are disadvantaged in the sense that they are not being developed to their fullest potential", "I do believe that there are individuals, who tend to come from low income, racial and ethnic groups, for whom even the greatest system does not function satisfactorily", "love and goodwill" are not enough, one must "confront the background behind this love and goodwill", "we must examine what constitutes relevant curriculum and resources for curriculum", "relevant curriculum is a function of community/school interface".

Remarks:

I intend to prepare my remarks while the others were speaking, so now they'll have that opportunity. The assignment, near as I can gather, was rather vague-talk for five or ten minutes with one or two of the ideas I might have. I almost feel like I'm supposed to give a one-page version of War and Peace. But let me give few comments, which would express my own biases and my own views in the area. First of all, it seems to me that in a certain sense all of our pupils are disadvantaged if we consider that all education that does not provide for the fullest development of the individual potential. That is, education today is in a sad state and, therefore, all pupils are disadvantaged. Now one could take that position and argue it rather strongly so that, in effect, the recipients are the clients or patrons of education are all disadvantaged. But I would rather use the term in a more specialized, more restrictive way, not denying the fact that more education would be vastly improved. In fact, as a curriculum specialist, this is my business, so to

speak. But I do believe that there are individuals, groups of individuals, who tend to come from low income, from racial and ethnic minority groups, for whom even the present system does not function very satisfactorily. No matter how one defines the ends and goals of American education, we simply are not achieving very well or not succeeding very well with this group. And it is this group that I would rather call the

disadvantaged. And the question, of course, is why these youngsters are not achieving and why the school is not succeeding with them. There are a number of theories, a number of explanations. One of the theories, it seems to me, really by itself explains the problem and gives us clear-cut leads as to how we might deal with such a problem. There are, of course, the people who argue the basis of genetics. The recent furor that Jensen stirred up with his article and which has coined a phrase, "Jensenism" reopened the

nature vs. nurture controversy. I reject the genetic approach, but this is my own reading of the research. There are those who reject equally the deprivation approach. There are those who argue that this is a racist society-a prejudiced society-and the word 'middle class' and the term 'middle class values' has become almost rejected by this group. There are those who argue that we simply don't allocate resources adequately. That a dollar spent in a ghetto school does not buy the dollar's worth of education as a dollar spent in a suburban white middle class school. So we have a number of explanations and a number of attempts to interpret and analyze, and it seems to me that our strategies for overcoming or for alleviating the problem are based on our beliefs, whether we express them or not, as to what the cause is. That is, if one is going to improve education for the disadvantaged depends in part on the explanation or the analysis of why the education is in such a bad state to begin with. Now the whole notion of equality again depends upon one's belief as to whether we're talking about equality of input, whether we're talking about equality of output, whether we're talking about equality of results, etc. And here again this is something that one needs to analyze because his plans and his activities would depend upon what he accepts as the basis for moving out. Now, my own feeling is that one of our problems is that we have attempted to arrive at panaceas or uniform solutions. We have expected that the single program or the project will, in fact, alleviate all of the problems. Now our idea that there are many differences with respect to the needs of individuals, that groups of individuals require differential programs and that no single project is going to really resolve the problem for the American school. There are differences, it seems to me, for example, if you take blacks living in Harlem. Their needs are different from blacks living in rural Florida. There are differences in Puerto Ricans whose first language is Spanish, for example, as opposed to Mexican Americans whose first language is also Spanish. It seems to me that with all these differences that there are certain common elements-and one is that all of them are going to be in some kind of formal schooling situation. It seems to me that they're going to be exposed to some kinds of experiences. And, therefore, in all instances we can begin to focus in on certain aspects, certain elements, and certain components of the educational process, which might make a difference. But we can talk then of education in terms of a teacher and a classroom, or we can talk about a school or a school system or a region, etc. And I would hope that we would talk differently for each of these. And one of our problems is that

sometimes we're talking about a teacher in a classroom in one part of our sentence, and in the next part of our sentence we're talking about a school like New York City with a million kids and a thousand schools, etc. Now I would hope that if I were to begin in my five minutes I could only begin. If I were to begin, where would I begin? I think the key it seems to me, is with the instructor. Now the instructor being the (I'm using the term

instructor rather than teacher) because it seems to me that all staff members, all adults who relate to schools and to schooling-and I might interject here, it seems to me, that one of the things that's happened with respect to the concern for the disadvantaged is that it has broken open our notions of what constitutes schooling. We used to consider that all education or most education took place in the school and the formal situation. And what the concern with the disadvantaged has done has been to loosen up our thinking to the point where the street academy may be more effective than the classroom-where the

various kinds of programs that are held in non-school agencies tend to be more effective than our school program-where our opportunities that are provided for tutoring and for work study, etc. tend to be more effective than 50-minute Carnegie Unit, etc. So that we've loosened up here our notion of who can teach, who is a teacher, who is a staff member? Therefore, when I talk about-beginning with 'instructor' I'm talking about a range of personnel. With respect to all instructors, one place to begin with respect to their teacher training is clearly in an analysis of their own biases and their own prejudices and how these operate in an instructional situation. And one way of coming at this would be to provide for a range of experiences of working with disadvantage right from the start of a teacher-training program and have an opportunity to explore and examine the reactions and the consequences of one's behavior. Little things, for example, facial expressions or the way one reacts to a speech pattern of a youngster, etc., or, we don't have time to go through that. But I'm convinced that love is not enough and goodwill is not enough. Secondly, it seems to me that we need to provide teachers with improved procedures for diagnosis and individualization of instruction. We talked during the conference about how can we do anything with 40 kids. I think there's nothing sacred about any number of kids. And I suspect it's easier to have one kid and one teacher or one kid and one adult. Yet my own children have gone to school in England where a teacher with 42 five-year-olds and 48 eight-year olds and 48 ten-year-olds, where there was more individualization than I see in some of our suburban schools that have 20-21 kids. I'd rather say, "how can we deploy our resources for better diagnosis, better individualization, better differentiation of instruction"- I think it can be done. It will mean shaking up the way we teach. It will mean shaking up of what constitutes teaching and learning in the first place. I think there's much more that one could say.

My second area of focus would, of course, be on curriculum and resources for curriculum. The notion of what constitutes relevant experiences, relevant curricula, all of this, of course, would be tied to our diagnosis procedures and our understanding of the needs and putting our focus perhaps much more on teaching kids how to learn, or making it possible for them to use their learning skill instead of beginning with some of the readiness procedure, etc., that we deal with now. So that without ignoring or minimizing

the importance of other aspects of the community, availability of resources, the supervisors and the administrators that curb all our creative teaching skills, etc., without talking about any of these other factors I would say that the place to begin, it seems to me, is on the instructional process, and it is at that point that I would back into the teacher-training process for dealing with disadvantaged.

Mr. Erskine Caldwell

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

"Creative person", "the system builds in to thwart the individuals' attempts at expression", "after kindergarten, the individual (creative) is stifled" and that, "there should be some method (unspecified) for an individual to not have to go through these years of being stifled."

Remarks:

I suppose everyone knows why I am here---not being a scholar myself, but learner, I come here not to give out any advice whatsoever. I feel very much like peanut butter must feel. You know, when you're peanut butter you spread it on a piece of bread and then you put another nutritious piece of bread on top of that and you have a sandwich, Well, I feel like the peanut now, between these sandwiches that are being made by experts. Being in the so-called field of communication-a good example of what a writer believed to be communication, I think, was exemplified not long ago by a college student whose grades had slipped below the line, so to speak, and he was drafted into the army, much against his principles. And what happened was that when he was sent to the training camp, the sergeant noticed that this young man spent all his free time walking around the grounds looking for scraps of paper. And when he found a scrap of paper he would pick it up and look at it, read it, and throw it aside, and say, "That's not it." Well, this went on so much that the sergeant was baffled by this behavior that he sent him to the army psychiatrist to find out why he was always picking up paper and looking at it and throwing it away and saying, "That is not it." So after the army psychiatrist had talked to him for several hours and got no satisfactory information out of him, the army psychiatrist wrote out an army discharge as being mentally unfit. So the young man looked at it, read it, and said, That's it." But, you know, trying to be a little bit serious about this matter as a learner, I think what really impresses me about the disadvantaged or advantaged in college, in high school and grammar school and so forth, is the fact that there's such a gap between the early years and the later years of a writer's life. Being a writer, I will say a writer; it could be an artist, it could be anything. You know, in early days of the kindergarten, Head Start, and so forth, children are given a freedom to do their thing. They can cut out paper dolls or they can color Halloween lanterns and everything of the sort and no one criticizes the children for spending their time doing this. That's called creative learning. Well, when a child gets out of kindergarten, out *of* Head Start, and so forth, out of primary grades, then he runs into this roadblock, so to speak.

You can't do that. You've to do it this way. And so I think he becomes a little bit stifled, in a way, if he has any creative urge at all. And, it seems to me, that there should be-I would classify this type of student as one of the disadvantaged, because he has an urge to create something-whatever it might be-he might be an inventor for all we know, but he

wants to do these things himself that he's thinking of, and that appeal to him. And yet he has to conform to the rigid rules and regulations and standards that are set up for all children. Well, then you skip the years, we'll say from high school into college, and then this person comes out. Then he feels a freedom that he has had stifled in him for all these years, but he might have been conditioned to such an extent that there no longer ex the creative effort that he had imbedded in him or was inherent in him to begin wi it seems to me that the exceptional child will favor just being an ordinary creative p on. There should be some method for a learner not to have to go through the years of being stifled by regulations and standards that really are not helping him to be a completed creative artist or writer or musician or whatever his urge is going to be. So there, you see as a learner I'm going against the grain with these experts. They are going to tell you their policies and findings in scholarship. So I just want to be one of the outside observers who's going to say, "well, I'll think that over. I'm not going to accept what you say, yet; but may-be I'll thank you.

Dr. Herbert Aurback

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

"One of the major problems of the study of disadvantaged is the terminology we use to label these people", "the genesis of such labeling was ethnocentricism", school as a change agent, school structures in need of in-depth analysis, learn how to negotiate the system.

Remarks:

It could be difficult for a professor to have to get up before an audience and speak in some kind of time set. I'm used to speaking in 75-minute modules and trying to regulate myself to five or ten minutes, I put down some notes. And what I decided when I had these notes down, that I had the sum-total of my knowledge on this one page of paper here. As a sociologist I think I was with the whole problem of the disadvantaged by looking at terminology that we use. I think we carry with us certain implications in the terminology, and I think the social scientists are very clearly to blame for the terminology that we use. Educators have adapted to terminology that we have given to them. We started out be referring to these young people as being culturally deprived. It was a pretty ethnocentric way of looking at culture. What it said is-these young people who come from Black communities and Indian communities, Puerto Rican and Mexican American communities don't have a culture. They've been deprived of the privilege of having the wonderful culture, the wonderful civilization that we of the white middle class have. Then we changed our terminology to talk about the culturally disadvantaged. It carried the same implication, but what it said, in effect, that-oh yes, they have a culture, but their culture isn't as good as ours. They are disadvantaged because they don't have-they don't share this culture that we have. I think perhaps, and social scientists in recent years have been turning to another term. I think one at least that doesn't carry with it the patronizing attitude, and that is at least we can refer, I think, fairly reasonably to people who come from minority groups who are poor as being culturally different. And I think at least with this we don't imply any kind of superiority because certainly we also recognize that Russia or England or France also has different cultures and they - that in some ways that difference doesn't mean that they are inferior to us - although sometimes the American tourist gives that impression when he's abroad. This is the first thing that I would do as a social scientist in talking about the educational problems of this group of young people. I think we have to make this terminology more precise. We're talking, I think, about people who are different in terms of cultural background they have-people who are economically poor and I think that's the only one of the real qualities that we can talk about across the lines. Certain youngsters are educationally disadvantaged in trying to negotiate the system of a school-a school system that is structured along particular

value systems that tends to be middle class and dominated by, in many instances, very racist attitudes towards people who are different. I think these are things that we can talk about. That these people are in fact, educationally disadvantaged, I think, is also correct. While as a social scientist I think also I have to take a look at some of the other impacts of social science on our understanding of these young people. I think that I would agree very completely with some of the points that Dr. Passow made that really there are many explanations of why these young people are disadvantaged and much of it is based on research that has been overly generalized. We talk about the kind of homes and communities they come from. I think what this has done is given us a different kind of explanation other than the genetic explanation to say why these people are really disadvantaged. I think, that we really don't know very much about the kinds of homes and kinds of communities and the kinds of cultures that these young people come from and its real impact on the learning process, as we have focused in on certain characteristics and we've generalized from it. We forget about the tremendous variability within these groups and about the fact that they bring into our school system many characteristics, which are precisely the kind of things that might help them in the learning process. We have avoided them and have failed to identify them in the process. I think it's important for teachers and educators to recognize that the area of their effectiveness is the school. Yes, these young people are poor-and culturally different-and for these reasons they are disadvantaged in negotiating this educational system that we have. So what can you do about it? We aren't going to change the culture they came from. As teachers, we can't put very much into the fact that they're poor. What we can do is do something about the kinds of experiences they have in this institution we call the school. This is the area where we can be effective as teachers, as educators. And, I think, when we recognize this, what we begin doing is looking at the school as an instrument for change, as a system where change has to take place. We have to begin understanding what the structure of this school place is. What is it about the school that makes learning so difficult for these young people? When we begin to focus on this, – we begin to take away the crutches we have, by saying that every time a youngster isn't making it in the school it's because he comes from an environment that doesn't prepare him adequately to deal with the system. The issue is what are we doing as educators in the school system that makes this-that accounts for the tremendous rate of failure we have in terms of our recognition of failure? Remember, it's our definitions that we're using-we're the ones that set up the criteria of success and failure-and if we're failing, then as educators we have to look within the structure of the learning process-within the structure of the institution of the school itself. There are lots of things we can, in fact, look at in these institutions, and I don't feel we have nearly enough time to begin pointing those out in the few minutes that I have here. So, if we're going to really affect educational achievement of these children, what we have to do is begin effectively changing the school as a social system-as an environment to learning. This means that we really have to begin to say, "well, what's so sacred about the ways we go about doing things?" We will have to open up the system, making the system more flexible, and not restricting ourselves with the kind of restraints that we now have in education. We really have to begin changing the very structure in which we operate, and I think that this is what is

absolutely necessary if we're going to help these children to negotiate the system, it's the only way we can help them to negotiate the system. The other point that I think I ought to make here is that there probably is one precise piece of data that we can get from our research and that is, if children are going to learn in a school that they have to have a reasonably good conception of themselves as learners. They've got to have a self-concept that will allow them to believe that they can learn in that system. This is the one piece of data that I think social scientific research is pretty conclusive about. That's the only piece of data that I think I can suggest. At least I haven't seen any evidence to the contrary. Perhaps some others have, but I haven't. If this is true, then it seems to me that one of our major paths in school is to sensitize teachers to this and to the kind of culture in which these children come from so that they learn something about it in a way that will help them to respect children for what they are, as this is what I feel school doesn't do to many children. It teaches them that what they are, is all bad and this is what they ought to be; this is precisely what they should not be doing. What we ought to be doing is finding the things in their culture that need reinforcement-we have to be looking for the strengths, for the contributions that their culture will bring to the learning situation. We have to quit negating what they had learned in the school. Really, what we need is teachers who respect their language, their culture, their background and who, in effect, are saying, "these are things that are real, are important to you, when we deal with these things in the school," what we begin to do is suggest to the child that there are other things out here that might also be important to you and here are some choices for you, here are some alternatives for you, and here are different ways of saying things. Not what you are saying is wrong, but the way you are saying it is wrong, but here is an alternate way that you might in time negotiate that system out there that you're going to have to eventually deal with might be a useful way of doing it. I think this is a very important assignment for teachers, because our teachers really have not had enough understanding of this and they do not, in fact, respect the children that they have in school-many of them do not. I suggest also, and this is my final point-that one of the most effective ways of assuring that the teacher and administrator in the school will begin really showing this kind of respect is by bringing members of the culturally different communities into the decision-making process of education, through new methods in addition to school board membership. In some communities, I would argue very strongly for decentralization and local control. But I don't think these are enough. I think we must begin thinking about effective ways of bringing the interaction between the community and the school system to a much more-to a point where it's much more effective and much more fruitful than the kind of PTA type of arrangement that we have now, which is really not at all effective in dealing particularly with youngsters of this group. I'm not even sure it's very effective in dealing with the middle class parts of our society.

Dr. Charles Keith

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

Anxiety, pain, guilt, self-scrutiny, common pathway, misnomer, implanting, imparting, "we should be somewhat tolerant of ourselves as professionals." "...The individual child; his group isn't critical, but his background is." ". teach a child by means of a working relationship.", ".. get hold of a mechanism to work with children...",

Remarks:

If a historian could kind of join us and see the struggles we're going through as professional groups dealing with these issues, he might tell us that this is a regular cycle that people go through and we're just repeating it. We made a discovery in the last 15 or 20 years; the disadvantaged that have been with us for generations-centuries-but professionally we discovered them. And in this discovery and learning about this, we have experienced anxiety, pain, a lot of guilt, a lot of self-scrutiny within our field. In so doing and making a discovery we tend at first to generalize as speakers have already noted. In many ways we're like Columbus who comes over and the Indians come out on the canoes to meet him. He goes back to Europe and tells them about Indians and we're still trying to shake some of those-even still being called Indians, a misnomer. It's hard to shake those generalizations. But, as with the Indians, we discover as we learn more about them as individuals, we discover their differences, and a lot of our early generalizations that came with the shock of discovery. Unfortunately in the early stages of discovery we have to be practical and do things and we base programs on the basis of these early generalizations. Therefore, we equate the disadvantaged with those who lack verbal skills, those who have different styles than us, etc. These programs tend to fizzle out after a while, and I think we should be somewhat tolerant of ourselves as professionals as we try to learn about this field. So what might the psychologist or the psychiatrist have to contribute to this interdisciplinary approach? Just a couple of points-and they're really old points-and if they're right, then I'm sure many of you will say, "My gosh, this is what we're being taught in our first year education courses." We could keep in mind that whatever we do, the final common pathway in our endeavors still centers on the individual child; his group isn't critical, but his background is. What we finally do with the child in our classrooms centers on him and him alone, because all our educational efforts are centered toward implanting something-imparting something to the individual child. He must come out with something from our endeavors. I think the people in child development, the child psychology-psychiatry field can continue to contribute to these endeavors by pointing to this child and his past-his own unique individual past that is so often forgotten in programs as a start. The individual child still

brings his own unique set of genes to the program that we're setting up. He doesn't leave it out there on the street. This child faces an individual teacher who transmits something to him. There are many ways she can go about this, but in the final analysis she has to give something to him---working relationship. I know of no other way to teach a child than by means of a working relationship. All of this has to go on within this very complex group of family, neighborhood that you already heard about. I think we learned a lot about children. A lot of this is still directly applicable to new programs-the common pathway, and I think all too often unfortunately overlooked in our need to get something going. I think this is also much too complex for the teacher to master moment by moment as she works with her pupils. Sometimes it is hard for a group of professionals sitting around trying to get hold of a mechanism to work with children, and we asked our teacher to go into a classroom and really keep these things in mind and utilize them day by day. So a final practical suggestion-any program that starts with this purpose on the final teacher-pupil interaction-find a common pathway, some means for the teacher to get her day by day, month by month performance with the Johnnys' and Marys' no matter what type of disadvantaged background they come from.

Dr. Raymond Patouillet

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

Connotation, remakers of personality, fellow workers, the insight of our labors, consulting, structure, "learning climate and environment remain closely interrelated", interpersonal relationships, "relationships are largely determined by roles we play", "roles are reflections of the structure", "inner' and "outer" worlds of the learner.

Remarks:

I think at the outset I should say that any similarity with my description of guidance and your experience with it is wholly unexpected. I think that the field of guidance has something to contribute to the education of the disadvantaged. Let me begin quickly with a connotation of guidance. Guidance professionals like to think they are concerned with the individualization of learning as we have discussed. We like to think that we are in the business of developing the student, as a learner in the school setting; therefore, there's a double focus. There's a focus on the individual within a particular kind of a role and in a particular setting-the school. Guidance people would be well advised not to consider themselves as remakers of personality, but perhaps to focus on the child as a learner. In this meeting, we talked about the school being in difficulty because it hasn't done a good job. In terms of its individual function, we have turned and leaned on psychology for years. Counseling, as you know, is not going to move in a direction if acceptance of the individual is not paramount characteristic. Therefore, acceptance of the individual is not merely a shibboleth for guidance people - it is a requirement for survival. However, we have found that counseling alone isn't going to do the job. Guidance people need to share with our fellow workers the insights of our labors; in doing this we talk about

consulting-we consult with teachers-we consult with parents. However, we are feeling an increasing need to become more involved with the school as a societal institution and

facilitator of a learning climate. Learning climate and environment remain closely interrelated. I think it's fair to say that the quality of interpersonal relationships is perhaps the most important factor in deciding the effectiveness of teaching. However, these relationships are largely determined by roles, which we play. These roles are reflections of the structure. The kinds of relationship I have with my son, or with my wife, or with a student are different. They are essentially different because of roles that are different that I play. Personally, it's exciting to consider the possibility that the counselor is in a rather unique situation in the school to play roles as mediator/mobilizer/initiator in a school system. Addressing the problem we face as viewing the struggles between teachers and principals, for example, who is the mediator?

The principal may view himself as a mediator, however he is perhaps more effective and accurately viewed by others as a father figure, effectively becoming a judge and jury all in one. I think therefore, those guidance people, with somewhat appropriate training than they get at the moment, could make a significant contribution in this sorely needed mediating function. Mediation might also take place between teachers and faculty and between the "inner" and "outer" worlds of the learner. An example might be to explain to the principal that he is controlling what is, by definition, a faculty meeting. I group these techniques under the heading "human relations skills and group dynamics" that, I feel have great usage potential within the schools.

Dr. Fred Gearing

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

"_it's their way of life", Schools and the Universities are the two most vulnerable institutions in our society, There, simply, is no incompatibility between each and every of those subcultures and anything we might reasonably call education, Schools are places where you go in if you're young or you're old and reenact that simulacrum of American society manipulated by those who are close to the levers of powers-and at the obvious expense of people who are further disenfranchised, new knowledge such as neurolinguistic, and the understandings of power dynamics (inside the classroom and the out in society) are critical,

Remarks:

Speaking about the disadvantaged, their life in school is not a happy one. To give you an example, it wasn't too many months ago when some very nice people who were friends of relatives said, "come to my house for dinner." And they had ourselves- myself and two other couples and this guy, the host, knew about orange trees because that was his occupational role; he had been to India to talk with Indians in India about orange trees and come back, and we had a very nice meal and all that. After the meal we saw some silent movies he had taken on his trip and I quickly discovered, as has been discovered in educational circles, that a film does not have a sound track it can really be educational because people are compelled to talk. During the presentation of this film, the chitchat going along tended to be, "Hey, that's a pretty piece of cloth," and "oh my, look at that." Also about every five minutes someone would say (I was sitting there trying to be as inconspicuous as possible), "But it's their way of life." I did not want to issue with these statements, however, I believed that somehow or another it is an individual's anthropological bias that causes him to say, "But it's their way of life." I raised that little point because it seems to me the mystery is not that obviously in all subgroups in society there are subcultures. They are historically existent and neither hidden or secret. The mystery is that we don't know already and that we have to tell ourselves these things at this date. There's nothing all that global or hard and difficult about going in and finding out how people acted. In investigating these cultures, somehow or another, I think the problem is not how we find out about these subcultures; the problem is what do we know about them already and why aren't we acting on that knowledge. In other words, it seems to me the mystery lies in structure of society and things having to do with money and power and the manner in which it does/doesn't flow. Within this study, the idea develops that those individuals involved in the educational institutions, schools and universities spearhead the social revolution and it just happens that as to which of these two institutions-schools or universities-are the most vulnerable, I don't know. However, these two institutions have got to be the two most vulnerable in American society and the

least able to spearhead anything. The problem is then to be understood as survival in the school and in the universities. My emphasis is on how we can survive given a wild, wild

world around us. As to the disadvantaged, I have very simplistic notions that there are people who are poor, and the problem being poor is that you don't have money and that money is the solution. Also, that there are people who are poor by and large also are weak. And the problem of being weak is that you don't have power. And that's the solution to that. However, I think, the other side of that coin is, that if you look back at anything that is known about the subcultures in American life that we are talking about; I know something about Indians, and vicariously you know things about others-and analyze the differences. There, simply, is no incompatibility between each and every of those subcultures and anything we might reasonably call education, there is no incompatibility to education per se. Parents want their kids to read, and children do also. There simply isn't in the cultures as such, anything that runs across the grain, anything against the current, when discussing education within a delimited perspective as typified by the 3 R's; which are, after all, all you need to know to get into college. Let me speak just one minute about school to try to find a solution. When discussing fundamental roles of the schools, educators must analyze whether they are talking about the rhetoric that flies around in the society at large; the thoughts/concepts underlying the verbiage needs to be analyzed to look at what the schools do. Concerning the schools, it seems to me it's perfectly obvious they succeed enormously at the real functional task that the society, in effect, has laid out for them, which is, of course, the continuation of the status quo, as schools are simulations of the status quo. Schools are places where you go in if you're young or you're old and reenact that simulacrum of American society manipulated by those who are close to the levers of powers-and at the obvious expense of people who are further disenfranchised. Schools are simulations-re-enactments of American life as selectively screened by those near the centers of power. It seems to me hardly debatable, but I never hear it said, so to speak. It may be because its not-it seems so obvious that I just have to repeat it at this juncture. I don't think this is a function of the poverty of spirit among peoples involved in universities and schools, nor is it a problem of failure of nerve of lack of will or any of these things. It has to do with real gut forces operating in society at large. In our present position, and I think to a man, at any rate, never mind you or me - I don't like the status quo. I do not like status quo and I'm in a situation of having to survive in an institution, as I think you are, which is, in reality, geared up to recapitulate the status quo. Therefore, what do we do to survive and get our little licks along the way? It seems to me that you put the things I've said together; one, that schools as institutions are really simulations of American society as selectively screened by those near the center of power; two, the fact there is no discrepancy between education in the 3 R's sense in any of these subcultures we're talking about. Put those things together, then you have a theory and how you account for failure or what you do about it and so on. Well, it seems to me to put it much too emphasis on schools, because they are what they are, and constitute a very strange environment for persons coming out of some other culture other than that aspect of the subculture reenacted in a school. At the simplest level, kids come in don't get the picture. That's a kind of game-that has a style to it and there's nothing really going to go on there, but you're supposed to play certain game this

way. And I didn't ever have to learn that where I was born; I knew it from the start. To explain, the first I.Q. test I ever took was as an adult; being from the South we didn't have those at

that time. When I went into the army I took this test, never occurring to me that it was anything but a game the designer of the test was inviting me to play with him, and I kind of knew the rules-no one told me, I just knew it. School, in general, is analogous to that. The first thing is that we come into the milieu just don't get that picture. They're in some degree of trouble because of that. The second thing, more seriously, is that you do engage in some task activities in this game-like structure which move because the schools are operationalized in an interpersonal relation style; it's a style of interaction that rubs you the wrong way. Much more seriously, because the schools are what they are, they really do constitute a total assault on the identities of children coming from various sub-cultures-a real assault, however unintentional, and it doesn't matter whether you say, "I love you, Johnny." You know, it is in your affective behavior you're saying, "you know, you better shape up, man, because that isn't the way it is and don't say 'ain't' and all that." The question is, therefore, how do you survive in a situation which schools or institutions do that kind of thing-there really is no incongruence between subcultures and what we narrowly call education; we fail because of extraneous things, this assault of identity and other things. How do you survive? I think the essential thing one does is to look out for those kinds of things that can be done in a classroom so that the teacher can see better what is going on in that classroom with those kids. That's it, it comes down to that one simple thing. Anything and everything that one can imagine doing that enables the teacher to see that behavior, see that child, see that child in his interaction with another child, what's he saying when he did that to that other child, what's he saying to me when he behaves this way, etc. The things that can be done to make precise and accurate and humane the simple communication problem within that classroom. Couple of examples: A teacher in his head says, "I think he wants to start thinking better and about communication, may say, you know, 'button, button, who's got the button?' Looking at school systems in the community at large as power systems and sort of delineate who's exercising authority on who, you've already got a diagram of communication flow. The power situation is such that, you know, you tune in-you're really curious about what's going on in the classroom, in the school-you tune in on the power facts and get them and then you see the communication flow as it in reality is. There are two implications of this: one, in the situation inside a classroom you kind of give up power that someone gave, you know, if you can do it. In the external society obviously you come out with, you know, red power-black power-vocal power-all kinds of power-intellectual power. Second, a certain kind of knowledge helps, and allows me to posit an example. There's a new field called the socio-linguistics of communication, here's a whole very exciting new field in linguistics that is emerging around a very simple fact that everyone of us knew and have always known, but somehow or another it gets by you. Simply stated it is this: every one of us has five or six dialects, utilizing them in relation to occasion and location. The learning and research situations are under what

occasions do you turn on what dialect-whoever you are? The second is how do you learn to turn on this repertoire of dialects appropriately. The learning process is not only learning the language, but also learning when to use language-this language as against that language. It is my belief that situations like this ought to be within the scope of teacher training programs. A third thing that should be mentioned is that classroom structure, that set of curricula, those devices, those procedures, that which makes up the shape of the day is good by these criteria or bad by the same criteria. That which allows the teacher to view the child in his individual performance and his individual expression, but allows the teacher to view the child that way, not a social isolate, but sees him in his real interactions with other children and other audiences is of the greatest use. Those kinds of curricula that affect us positively are good. Those kinds of classroom organization-heterogeneous groupings, for example, of all kinds. I wouldn't, if I had choice, teach a class unless it's three grade levels, at the very least. All of these things help in those respects. In reality, it's a survival problem and I'm just saying the only answer to it for us who have to survive in and get in our little licks along the way, is the capacity to see. Those things, which help us to see these behaviors as they unfold, are good; things that hinder that are bad.

Dr. Edward Fagan

The key words, statements, and concepts discussed during this session were:

Language education "folds", "spindles", and "mutilates" students; language stereotype; prescriptive isolate approach; behavioral objectives; individualized instruction; open, flexible approach to curriculum; the roles of electives in school program; prescriptive, descriptive, transformational grammar; teaching English as a second language; sensory bombardment; language experience related to real life; school centered language arts program.

Remarks:

Thus far in the sensorium, I've heard several things with respect to language education: things, which tend to imply that much of what we do in communication "folds, spindles and mutilates" students. To that end I'd like to explain areas where English in today's classroom might be more effectively utilized to ameliorate this particular phenomenon. You notice, for example, that Mr. Caldwell referred to the "grammar" school rather than 'elementary school.' We are familiar with Winston's latest blast "tastes good like a cigarette should"; this is the stereotype of language and the kind of correctness, that, I think has the sequel of hamburgerizing kids when they enter an environment where that kind of perspective correctness is a requirement for status advancement. Due to the time factor, I would like to simply identify five areas where the study of English has changed its dimension-and that dimension where English, in its changed dimension, might effectively be utilized in a classroom and then summarize by concentrating on one of the five so called language areas. First, as I've already mentioned, language would be a major concern of the new approach to communication in the classroom; however, this particular situation has some problems of packaging. A second major area is the interdisciplinary study as an approach to English. The idea here is that since language is employed in every discipline-arithmetic, social studies, and science-that English should not be confined to a prescriptive or isolated approach. Therefore, you may, for example, talk about the communication and the style of communication and its implication within science, within social studies and other subject areas. This would be the interdisciplinary approach. The third area is that of behavioral objectives. What competencies, what skills are these kids to arrive at after a particular experience? The experiences are they to have in the classroom? Are these skills observable? If observed, what kind of criteria would you use for ascertaining whether one, the behavior should appear in class in the first place and two, whether the material and /or behavior are ameliorated within the constraints of the school system. A fourth area, and one previously mentioned, is the

individualized instruction area. However, this approach presupposes that teachers have a detailed knowledge of such things as behaviors, that they are well aware of the diagnostic system that can be employed, and that by using these particular systems there would be some kind of reward for the kids in the classroom. A final area, which is implicit throughout these four areas, is that, in moving to more open, flexible approach to curriculum, the role of electives throughout the school program will become increasingly important. The high school riots, and strikes particularly, are beginning to reflect this "relevancy" (a term I don't like because it's too much like cliché' now), however, in fact, what is so sacred about a four year English program? Also, why must it be constrained within a 50-minute period, a Carnegie Unit? On these grounds, what alternatives are available? There are programs throughout the country where the whole senior high school program has become elective and a student who's interested in short story writing and analysis of news media and the psychoanalysis of Spiro Agnew, these kinds of things, are all possibilities within the realm of English. Therefore, these five areas; to summarize, language, interdisciplinary study, behavioral objectives, individual instruction and elective programs are, I think, strategies that the current communications approaches emphasize. To focus more specifically on linguistics, there are three major areas-prescriptive, descriptive, and transformational. The prescriptive area is typified by Winston ad where the teacher is always to correct. The descriptive is more anthropological, however, somewhat far removed from the classroom. In this approach the acceptance is whatever is current and new. It is the kind of language that one should engage in and the student should engage in within the classroom. The third and the most restrictive, in several ways, is a type of English called transformational grammar. It's a - the word derived from the fact that there are allegedly certain kernel sentences in language, and that when a kid walks into a classroom, like kindergarten, he already has imbedded in his nervous system ways of transformation of grammar as it's currently used in many classrooms. Although there are some benefits to come from transformational grammar, as it's presently taught in most classrooms these three concepts of linguistics are somewhat in conflict. With respect to dialects and the study of dialects, there is assumption that the way that we work with some of these kids is to transform dialect into acceptable English, whatever that is. Within this context, the strategies used by foreign language teachings are supposed to be the things that are most effective in the classroom. In teaching English as a second language, teachers set up blocks and structures and have kids come and fill in the slots and so forth. Students recognize quickly that this is a game. No one ever talks like those slots structures, no one ever fits into that kind of thing; and to that extent they either play the game or, as in most cases, don't play the game and say, "This is not the way people talk, or learn things." From that particular content a more viable approach to linguistics would be the language experiences in the classroom, which are related to real life. In this case, you get what is known as "sensory bombardment" that is the kind of thing the foreign service employs in teaching adults a foreign language; there are all kinds of films, film strips, records, dialogues, tape recordings, and other audiovisual aids, constantly attempting to provide all kinds of interesting things to students and to give them the opportunity to explore the ranges of possibilities of language. One of the directors in Washington, has come up with two neat classifications,

may be too neat, for this kind of approach. One, he says, is that you have a message that is constant, but the images that can be stated like this, "The train will arrive at four o' clock this afternoon." Another approach to language teaching is the Moffatt approach. Moffatt was at Harvard and is now with the University of California at Berkley. He has developed a student-centered language arts program K through 12. The impact here is on a gestalt of the program. Usually we do things piecemeal; however, this is a total program based on the student-generated material, material from their writings, classroom activities, tape recordings, and things like that. Out of that kind of language experience is the kind of openness, the kind of flexibility in language instruction environment will probably be the most effective.

SELECTED POINTS OF VIEW

Child in the School

"When a child first goes into school, he may not be functioning at an adaptive level for survival-and more expected of him than just the mere survival type. He may find himself, as you say, exploring the situation, looking it over and if it doesn't relate very personally to him he may not venture into that situation, because it is not relevant to his needs-as he views his needs. The way he views his needs may make a difference than what his teacher view his needs." (Patouillet)

Classroom Behavioral Expectations

" . . I don't think I can give the answers as a sociologist of what ought to be the behavioral expectations of a particular classroom. I think that becomes something that the teachers and the parents and the supervisory people have to work out for themselves. I would argue that as soon as the kids are old enough they ought to play a role in that too. And may be even at the very beginning to some extent. So that the behavioral expectations ought to be continually changing." (Aurbach)

Creativity

"There should be some method for a learner not to have to go through the years of being stifled by regulations and standards that really are not helping him to be a completed creative artist or writer or musician or whatever his urge is going to be." (Caldwell)

"Well, when a child gets up out of kindergarten, out of Head Start, and so fourth, out of the primary grades, then he runs into this roadblock, so to speak. You can't do that. You've got to do it this way. And so I think he becomes a little bit stifled, in a way, if he has any creative urge at all." (Caldwell)

Culture

"All right, as I look at an alien culture somewhere and elicit the code, I see there myself. Because I have now seen through the code to the man that I am and they are and therefore, we are, and that's the payoff and it's all over. And I come back saying cultures

are good. They're equally good and equally bad, you know, so to speak. They're equivalent. They're all human and it's the job to see oneself which is to see man in that other place." (Gearing)

"If you live in a culture designed for your kind of people in these simple terms, then it's a good culture, it's a fine culture for you in most cases. If you live in a culture which is designed for somebody else and designed to exclude you, for the most part, this can not be considered a culture as good as the culture could be considered from the other standpoint. So in that particular way I don't think we can equate culture and say they're all equally successful." (Gearing)

"I say all cultures and subcultures are equivalently benighted at this point in time-they're locked into vocabularies that usually are 'we-they'---often sometimes, you know, are sort of 'parochial we' and virtually never 'universally we' types of vocabularies.' (Gearing)

Community Control

"I think the whole notion of community control has become a cliché and I don't know whether we want to go off on that. There's no community control in any situation that I know of-real community control-but you have in most situations is a group of individuals or groups jockeying for power and at one time in the ascendancy--one group is in the ascendancy and in power-another group is in the ascendancy." (Aurbach)

Communication

"Communication or a way of reaching. Now saying I can't reach that child. How many times have I asked that question to myself? If I am not able to reach that child then the most part I don't understand *is* myself. That's why I am not being able to reach him. I think there is some sort of identity among all of us with the self." (Aurbach)

Disadvantaged

"...we changed our terminology to talk about the culturally disadvantaged. It carried the same implication, but what it said in effect that -oh yes, they have a culture, but their culture isn't as good as ours. They are disadvantaged because they don't have - they don't share this culture that we have." (Aurbach)

"I don't think that when we talk about the difference between the culture of France and the culture of the United States that one necessarily connotes any superiority or inferiority...and I think the same thing should be true in terms of looking at Black and

White or Indians and Whites in the United States. Or the differences between the Hindu and Muslim religions in India." (Aurbach)

"And disadvantaged kids, poor kids, slum kids-we insist that they go to school. We insist that they learn academics. And we measure them by whether they do learn academic or not. This is where we measure success or failure." (Dwyer)

"First of all, it seems to me that in a certain sense all of our pupils are disadvantaged if we consider that all education which does not provide for the fullest development of the individual potential. That is, education today is in a sad state and therefore all people are disadvantaged." (Passow)

"Labeling, categorizing, giving a symbolic name to classify a group has been considered as an administrative construct with a goal in mind that this will facilitate the functioning of the group. This is somewhat optimistic and positivistic argument in favor of labeling children. A group of children, focus of our discussion, have been given variety of labels such as disaffected, disadvantaged, needy, poor, slow learner, slow gifted, etc. The participants of the conference discussed to great length the ramification and impacts of labeling. Despite the fact that the category and classification as a tool has some legal utility as the congress and people like to know is being done for certain group but classification in itself has caused enormous problems in that it gets teachers to treat children as though they are disadvantaged." (Fagan)

".... I personally prefer the term disaffected and try to qualify that term by saying that this term applies to all children, not just the so called disadvantaged and their reaction to or cop out from the present system of education." (Fagan)

"I think it's rather unfortunate that social scientists have coined terms like culturally deprived. I think we have to talk a little bit about what we mean by these terms. It seems to me that the most unfortunate term of all is the idea of culturally deprived. I can't vision since no human being grows up in a culture can be deprived of that culture. He comes into society with a culture, he is born into a culture, and he is raised in that culture. I think again that it tends to be the kind of conceptualization that whether culture I have is the proper one anybody who hasn't got it is deprived. And it's about as egocentric as we can get. I think we tend to do the same thing with term disadvantaged. The concept is that our culture is the advantaged culture and everything else is disadvantaged in comparison. And I think this is a problem-a serious problem. We use these terms particularly towards minority groups; it becomes very paternalistic or racist in their connotation. Anthropologists and sociologists would agree that we should look at it as just culturally different. Culturally different doesn't presume any superiority or inferiority." (Aurbach)

Acceptance

Head start programs "must focus on acceptance of children of differing socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds." "Acceptance", in this case, is to be construed as "acceptance beyond tolerance level"--- a substantive change in attitude. (Singh)

Equality of Opportunity

"Now, the whole notion of equality of opportunity is again a notion that needs analysis because equality again depends upon one's belief as to whether we're talking about equality of input, whether we're talking about equality of output, whether we're talking about equality of results, etc." (Passow)

Grading

"It's interesting-it's impossible to think of something without a grading system." (Patouillet)

Environment and Learning

"Is there any reason why they can't learn the hard core? No, there is no reason why they can't learn the hard core. I don't think there's anything in environment that will erase this kind of thing. There may not be anything in environment that will reinforce it, and that's important, but I don't think there's anything that would particularly erase it." (Dwyer)

Guidance

"And counseling, as you know, is hardly going to move in any direction if acceptance of the individual is not the paramount characteristic of relationship. And so acceptance of individuals is not just a verbalization for guidance people-it is a requirement for survival." (Patouillet)

Learning

"It may be tension- producing, but maybe the best learning is the kind of learning that goes on that you are not consciously aware that you are pushing away a barrier and that the change is coming in a more integrated way. If the person doesn't fixate onto categories or things of this nature, well, then the person has nothing to relearn and I guess maybe we're talking about relearning. But possibly relearning if it's kind of an organic exploration and a finding out about things in a dissatisfied curiosity, I don't know-I think we may be getting at something in terms of how we do that only until something is structured and set-and we call it knowledge and maybe learning is the abandonment of this kind of attitude-I don't know. Well, anyway, it sure is hard to teach five - year - old kids to read and write and do arithmetic if you don't do it a natural way." (Dwyer)

Linguistics

" I think the idea that their language is wrong and that our language is right is something that has to be wiped out." (Fagan)

"The first thing that you've got to do with children is to get them to express themselves and communicate both in writing and in reading in a way that they're comfortable with. That's the first step. I think at some point you have to suggest to them that there are alternate ways of saying the same thing that they were saying. And they'll learn it and they'll accept that as long as at the same time you're not saying what they're saying is wrong."

"How many times have you heard people say, "Gee, I don't speak any dialect" who speaks a particular dialect because they think that's just language and all the other things are dialect. These are the people who are disadvantaged." (Fagan)

"Now to focus more specifically on linguistics-as you know, there are three major areas of linguistics-prescriptive, descriptive, and transformational. The prescriptive is, as is typified by Winston, where the teacher is always correct. The descriptive is more anthropological, but still somewhat far out with respect to the classroom. And there the acceptance is that whatever is current and news is the kind of language that one should engage in and the student should engage in the classroom. The third and the most restrictive, I think in several ways is a way is a type called transformational grammar. It's the word come from the fact that there are allegedly certain Kernel sentences in the language and that when a kid walks into a classroom like kindergarten he already has embedded in his nervous system ways of transforming these kernel sentences to communicate different ideas such as, time, things like that. The problem that transformation grammar as currently used in many classrooms is that you switch from the stilt walking diagram to what is called a programmed diagram and allegedly there are

some benefits to come from transformation of grammar, but as it's presently taught inmost classrooms these three areas of linguistics are somewhat in conflict." (Fagan)

"There is a new field called the sociolinguistics...here is a whole very exciting new field in linguistics that is emerging around a very simple fact that every one of us knew and have always known but somehow or another it gets by you. Simply stated that everyone has five or six dialects. We turn them on and off according to occasion. The learning and research situations are under what occasions do you turn on what dialect you are? The second is how do you learn to turn on this repertoire of dialects appropriately. The learning process not of learning the language, but of learning when to use the language-this language as against that language. " (Gearning)

Parent - Teacher Relationships

"I as an educator hopefully know a little bit more about teaching arithmetic than parents do. On the other hand, they know about their child that I do not know and the child can learn better with both of us than with either one of us alone. And I think this is important where you have a partnership. Not that we don't have certain expertise and not that the parents don't but respect each other." (Passow)

Power

" I'd like to bring up one question and that 's on the power. And I feel that in trying to give some power to the poor and powerless it is very important that they earn the power and it isn't just given and I'd like for us perhaps to examine ways in which power can be earned." (Aurbach)

School as a Community Agency

"...this is really what has to be done is that you really have to begin to think about what do you really believe the school ought to be doing and that's a community process." (Aurbach)

Teacher Self-Training

"And it is my feeling that for any classroom situation to really work like we're talking about for disadvantaged kids and other types of kids, there has to be built in some kind of monitoring system where the teacher feels free enough to talk about really what's

happening and all these processes and get some kind of feedback. Without this she's human, she experiences anxiety, she gets locked into rigid roles, and you get a lot of stereotypes about the classroom." (Caldwell)

Relationship of Teacher, Child and Social Groups are Interdependent

"But it would seem to me there was another ingredient which I think is implicit in many of the things we've said and that is to focus on the necessity of teachers enhancing the

self-concept of children. And by doing so, I think this means more than just sensitized to the culture in which that child operates. Sensitized in a way that will lead to respect for the child as a person and as a member of a sub-cultural group in the society which would mean, it seems to me also, in order to do this you almost have to have the involvement of the social groups in the decision-making process in the school system." (Passow)

Teaching Styles

"So I think we should develop styles of teaching that make reading and mathematics as purposeful now to the child as language was when he was a year and half when his parents, who didn't have any kind of academic experience at all, taught it in a very natural way." (Dwyer)

GRE

Test did not measure "personal self" or "imagination or what an individual might have to offer qualitatively." Educational decisions based solely on the quantitative inference and making predictions regarding educational achievements are limiting (Singh)

References

Adelatein, A.M., and Marmot, M.G. The health of migrants in England and Wales: Causes of death. In: Beevers, D.G., and Cruickshank, J.K., eds. Ethnic Factors in Health and Disease. Kent England: Wright, 1989.

Bauman, Gerald., Grunes, Ruth., Psychiatric rehablitation in the gheto; an educational approach. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974

Bebbington, P.E.; Hurry,J.; and Tennanr, C Psychiatric disorders in selected immigrant groups in Camberwell. Social Psychiatry, 16:43-51, 1981.

Biller, B., Berlinsky, Ellen B., Parental death and psychological development. Lexington, Mass : Lexington Books, 1982.

Botvin, G.J., and Schinke, S.P. The etiology and prevention of drug abuse among minority youth. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press, 1997.

Braden, Jeffery P., Deafness, deprivation, and IQ. New York: Plenum Press, 1994.

Carpenter, L., and Brockington, I.F. A study of mental illness in Asians, West Indians, and Africans living in Manchester. British Journal of Psychiatry, 137: 201-205, 1980.

Chiland, Colette., Young, Gerald J., New approaches to mental health from birth to adolescence. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Clark, R.E. Psychoses, income, and occupational prestige. American Journal of Sociology, 54: 433-440, 1949.

Cyrino Silveira, Monica., In Pandora's jar: lovesickness in early Greek poetry., Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1995.

Daniels, Cynthia R., Lost fathers: the politics of fatherlessness in America. New York: St.Martin's press, 1998.

Dennis, W., Infant Development Under Conditions of Restricted practice of minimum social stimulation. Gent. Psychol. Monogr. 1941, 23,143-149.

Dever, Carolyn., Death and the mother from Dickens to Freud: Victorian fiction and the anxiety of origins. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Dohrenwend, B.P., and Egri, G. Recent stressful life events and episodes of schizophrenia. Schizophrenia Bulletin, 7(1): 12-23, 1981.

Fourie. A.J., Sustained feeding or fasting affects levels of glucagon (IRG) in porcine plasma, gut and pancreas. Oslo, Norway: Norwegian University Press, 1987.

Giovanni, Andrea Cornia., Danziger, Sheldon., Child poverty and deprivation in the industrialized countries, 1945-1995. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Gottfredson, Denise C, and Gottfredson, Gary. Managing Adolescent Behavior: A Multiyear, Multischool study. American Educational Research Journal 30: No. 1, 179-215, 1993.

Grimm, Veronika E., From feasting to fasting, the evolution of a sin: attitude to food in late antiquity. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.

Hebb, D.O., The Organization of Behavior. New York: Wiley, 1949, 405b-415.

Hollingshead, A.B., and Redlich, F.C. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York, N.Y.: John Wiley Sons, 1958.

Hunt, J. Mc V., Intelligence and Experience. New York: Ronald, 1961.

Iggers, Jeremy., The garden of eating: food, sex, and the hunger for meaning. New York: Basic Bookd, c1996.

Jacobs, Lesley A., Rights and deprivation. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Jacoby, Russell., Glauberman, Naomi., The bell curve debate: history, documents, opinions. New York: Times Books, c1995.

Kammerman, Mark K., Sensory isolation and personality change. Springfield, Ill.: C.C.Thomas, c1977.

Klien, A.S., Blindness and Social Isolation Psycho-analytic Study of the Child, 1962, 17, 82-93.

Kogure, K., Hossmann, K.-A., Siesjo, B.K., Neurobiology of ischemic brain damage. Amsterdam; New York: Elsevier, 1993.

Klein, Martha., Determinism, blameworthyiness, and deprivation. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Leighton, D.C.; Harding, J.S.; Macklin, D.B.; Macmillan,A.M.; and Leighton, A.H. The Chapter of Danger: The Stirling County Study of Psychiatric Disorders and Sociocultural Environment: Psychiatric Symptoms in Selectd Communities. Vol. 3. New York, NY; Basic Books, 1963.

Lilly, John C., The deep self: profound relaxation and the tank isolation technique. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977.

Madden, Nancy A., Slavin, Karwit Nancy L, Dolan, Lawrence, and Wasik, Barbara A. Success for All: Longitudinal Effects of a Schoolwide Elementary Restructuring Program. American Educational Research Journal, 30, 123-148, 1993

Madow, Leo and Snow, Laurence H., The Psychodynamics of physiological studies on sensory deprivation. Springfield: Thomas, 1970.

Maine, Margo., Father hunger: father, daughter & food. Carlsbas. CA: Gurze Books, 1991.

Mangan, G.L., Psychological deprivation in childhood. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Myklebust, H.R., The Psychology of Deafness, Sensory Deprivation, Learning and Adjustment. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1964

Odegard, O. The incidence of psychoses in various occupations. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 2: 85-104, 1956.

Ogletree, Earl J., The socially disadvantaged: physiological and psychological aspects of deprivation. New York: MSS Information Corp. 1974.

Olson, James M., Herman, Peter C., Zanna, Mark P., Relative deprivation and social comparison. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associate, 1986.

Pepenoe, David., Life without father: compelling new evidence that fatherhood and marriage are indispensible for the good of children and society. New York: Martin Kessler Books, 1996.

Riesen, Austin H., The developmental neuropsychology of sensory deprivation. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Roberts, Albert R., Childhood deprivation. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1974.
Schultz, Duane P., Sensory restriction: effects on behavior. New York, Academic Press, 1965.

Shields, David L.L., The color of hunger: race and hunger in national and international perrspective. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, c.1995.

Singh,S.P., Dynamics of deprivation and educational implications-some hypotheses and Impressions. ERIC REPORT DOCUMENT ED 117 255. Wahsington, 1975.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., and Wasik, B.A. Preventing early school failure: Research, policy, and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1994.

Stricker, Edward M., Neurobiology of food and fluid intake. New York: Plenum Press, 1990.

Suedfeld, P., Turner,Jr.,J.W., Fine, T.H., Restricted environmental stimulation: theoretical and empirical developments in flotation Rest. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990.

Suedfeld, Peter., Restricted environmental stimulation: research and clinical applications. New York: Wiley, 1980.

Teddlie, Charles and Stringfield, Sam. Schools make a diffence: Lessons learned from a 10-year study of school effects. New York: Teachers College Press, 1993.

Terry, P.B.; Condie, R.G.; and Settatree, R.S. Analysis of ethnic differences in perinatal statistics. British Medical Journal, 281: 1307-1308, 1980.

Wakerman, Elyce., Father loss: daughters discus the man that got away. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.

Warner, R. Recovery From Schizophrenia: Psychiatry and Political Economy. London, England: Routledge & Kagan Paul, 1985/

Wilcox. J.A., and Nasrallah, H.A. Perinatal insult as a risk factor in paranoid and non-paranoid schizophrenia. Psychopathology, 20: 285-287, 1987.

Winnicott, Clare., Shepherd, Ray., Davis, Madeleine., Deprivation and delinquency. London; New York: Tavistock Publications in association with Methuen, 1984.

Zubek, John P., Sensory deprivation: fifteen years of research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.